

# Open Research Online

---

The Open University's repository of research publications and other research outputs

## The relationship of the son to the father in Justin Martyr

### Thesis

#### How to cite:

Herbert, John (1979). The relationship of the son to the father in Justin Martyr. PhD thesis The Open University.

For guidance on citations see [FAQs](#).

© 1977 The Author



<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Version: Version of Record

Link(s) to article on publisher's website:

<http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.21954/ou.ro.0000deab>

---

Copyright and Moral Rights for the articles on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. For more information on Open Research Online's data [policy](#) on reuse of materials please consult the policies page.

---

[oro.open.ac.uk](http://oro.open.ac.uk)

The Relationship of the Son to the Father  
in Justin Martyr

by

John Herbert

B.A.(Wales), B.A.(London), M.A.(Wales)

Date of submission: 23-1-78

Date of award: 18-6-79

This thesis is offered for the Ph.D. degree of the Open University  
and it pertains to the discipline of Theology.

September, 1977.

**BEST COPY**

**AVAILABLE**

Poor text in the original  
thesis.

Some text bound close to  
the spine.

Some images distorted

Abstract

The Introduction contains a discussion on the manuscripts of the works of Justin Martyr and draws attention to inaccuracies in previous authors. The texts of recent editors have been considered and the works of even more recent scholars on Justin have been assessed. To set the entire book in perspective has needed a general comment and this has involved a consideration of the sitz im leben of the works of Justin.

We tried to describe the being of God as we thought Justin imagined Him, Middle Platonist as our author was. We failed to find here the person of a beloved Father who cared deeply in a profoundly personal way for his children. Retribution seemed to be the way in which the Supreme Principle commanded obedience. The Incarnation of the Christ-Logos also drew upon the concepts of Middle Platonism. We were inclined to associate a Subordinate Son with ideas of the Gnostics and could not find escape from a conclusion that an intimate relationship between the Son and the Father played an insignificant part in Redemption. The sacrifice of Christ was interpreted as a penal substitution where there was some exorcistic stress on the nature of the sacrifice. Although Christ was a Mediator, there were elements present of magic, exorcism and certainly Gnostic ideas. The will of God was the greatest element in the relationship between the Father and the Son. We concluded that the tolerance for Gnostic ideas was so great in Justin that there were serious implications for what was considered 'orthodoxy' in the second century A.D.



Table of Contents

	Page
Title . . . . .	1
Abstract . . . . .	2
Table of Contents . . . . .	3
Acknowledgements . . . . .	4
Introduction . . . . .	6
The Father . . . . .	22
The Son . . . . .	77
Mediation . . . . .	114
Gnosticism . . . . .	161
Conclusion . . . . .	190
Bibliography . . . . .	194

### Acknowledgements

The subject matter of this work has been compiled during the infrequent minutes of a leisure time, snatched from the pressures of running a very large comprehensive school. In attempting to instil ideals into the pupils and teachers of my school, I have drawn strength from my Christian convictions and to these convictions, Justin Martyr has added his own contribution. In a pagan age, he was an apologist for the Christian faith and a man with a vocation. In twentieth century Britain and especially in its final quarter, it has not been easy to defy a philistine spirit and a nihilistic attitude to the nobler values of the great thinkers and philosophers.

My debt to Professor R.P.C. Hanson, Professor of Historical and Contemporary Theology at the University of Manchester, has been immeasurably profound. He has sharpened my mental equipment for the arduous demands of research. He has demolished naive conclusions with a deft monosyllable. He has compelled me to argue more fully judgements which have been too facile. He has tolerated with infinite patience juvenile blemishes and patent carelessness. But above all he has encouraged me to continue when my courage ran short. It has not been easy to study the often recondite matter for this work; Professor Hanson has been a superb supervisor. If this puny work of scholarship does not succeed in its immediate purpose, I have only myself to find culpable. I cannot thank him too much.

For the work itself, it will be impossible to pay my debt without unconscious omission of one name or another, especially after half a century of constant reading. I have attempted to acknowledge the help of others in my footnotes and in the bibliography. I have used constantly E. Hatch and H.A. Redpath, A Concordance to the Septuagint; R.H. Charles, The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the O.T. in English; J.H. Koulton and G. Milligan, The Vocabulary of the N.T.; G.W.H. Lampe, A Patristic Greek Lexicon. I have had frequent access to J.P. Nigne, Patrologiae Curcus Completus. For Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Polycarp,

the Didache, Barnabas, Hermas, the Martyrdom of Polycarp and the Epistle to Diognetus, the Loeb texts have been used. I have had constant recourse to the text of D.R. Bueno for all the works of Justin, and for Aristides, Tatian, Athenagoras and Theophilus of Antioch. The Loeb Philo and the Oxford texts for classical authors have been regularly employed. Where other editors have been used, the fact has been stated in the footnotes.

Without the initial teaching of the Rev. F.N. Miles of Pontypridd, without the instruction in the Christian faith in grimmer times from the Rev. E. Ridley Lewis, a parish priest of the Rhondda, and without the university inspiration of Professor R.G. Austin, formerly of the University of Wales, not one word of this work could have been attempted.

I am in the debt of Mrs. Wendy Davies of Lliswerry High School, Newport, for typing the manuscript.

My wife and family have seen me desert them daily from the hearth to the lonely study. My gratitude to them is beyond assessment.

Risca, Gwent, 1977.

### Introduction

The scope of the present study does not set out to include a history of the manuscripts of Justin Martyr's works. But it is a matter of regret that modern authors who have had occasion to refer in detail to the later history of the manuscripts, have either repeated inaccuracies from the works of predecessors or have made casual mistakes in their references. In the interests of accuracy and because there are omissions in the record, a brief account will not be out of place. Our knowledge of the works of Justin principally depends on two manuscripts<sup>1</sup> in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, the Codex Regius Parisinus Graec. CDL and the Codex Regius Parisinus Suppl. Graec. CXC. The former contains all the known works of Justin with the interesting feature that Apology II precedes Apology I. The latter contains only the manuscripts which came into the Royal Library after 1740 A.D. It contains (in company with extracts from Clement of Alexandria, Origen and others) a few excerpts from Justin with some brief notes in Latin. These excerpts are of little value for textual emendation. The Codex CDL is full of deliberate interpolations and gratuitous additions.

<sup>1</sup>cf. D.R. Bueno, Padres Apologistas Griegos, p.180: 'el único manuscrito'.



The Codex Claromontanus 57, Phillips MS. 3081, 'Justini Martyris Opera' (n.d.) is a very imperfect copy of Codex CDL. Modern authors have not checked its imperfections since they are content either to repeat wrong reference numbers or give it a wrong location. A.W.F. Blunt describes it as a 1541 A.D. Codex and gives a wrong reference number.<sup>1</sup>

When the Jesuits were expelled from France in 1764 A.D., the Codex Claromontanus 57 passed from the Jesuits' Library into the hands of a Johannes Meerman. On his death in 1824 A.D. the Codex came to England and into the library of a Sir Thomas Phillips of Middlehill, near Broadway, Worcs. The number of the Phillips Codex viz. LVII is the reference number given to the Codex both by the Meerman Library and in the notes of transfer in the Catalogue of the Jesuits' Library. The Codex was inherited by the Rev. J.A. Fenwick of Cheltenham in 1872. It is sometimes known as the Codex Fenwickianus. This Codex Claromontanus LVII is in the group of manuscripts deposited by the Fenwick trustees in the British Museum (Loan No. 36). Modern authors failed to pursue this loan to its present home and seem content to repeat untrue reports.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> A.W.F. Blunt, *The Apologies of Justin Martyr*, p. lii numbers the Codex as LXXXII. But Codex Claromontanus LXXXII is a manuscript of Chrysostom's Sermones, once Phillips MS 1441, now in the Bodleian Library. The Catholic Encyclopaedia repeats the error of Blunt s.v. Justin Martyr, p. 581.

<sup>2</sup> e.g. D.R. Bueno, loc. cit. p. 180: 'en la biblioteca de Cheltenham'; cf. Catholic Encyclopaedia, loc. cit. p. 581: 'actually at Cheltenham, in the possession of M.T.F. Fenwick'.

Van Winden was given wrong information by J. Smit Sibinga of Bloemendaal, Holland and thought that the manuscript was now in the U.S.A.<sup>1</sup> The Codex Ottobonianus Graecus CCLXXIV of the 15th Century contains Apology I 65 - 67. This is in the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Rome and is catalogued thus: Codices manuscripti graeci Ottoboniani Bibliothecae Vaticanae descripti . . . recensuerunt E. Feron et F. Battaglini Romae 1893, p. 153. This contains Apology, I 65 - 67, and appears to represent a manuscript tradition different from Codex CDL. This apart from the quotations of Justin made by later authors, is one of the checks on Codex CDL which we have.

There are two other manuscripts of interest. The Codex Ambrosianus H. 142 infer. is in the National Library at Milan and it dates to 1564 A.D. The Codex Monacensis Graecus 121, fol. 523: Expositiv. fidei and Codex Monacensis Graecus 136, fol. 39: XVII quaestiones et responsiones ad orthodoxos et graecos are in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich.<sup>2</sup> Codex Monacensis - 'Munich Manuscript' is a much abbreviated form mostly used in the older literature for a manuscript of the Bavarian State Library (a term virtually never used for manuscripts of the Munich University Library). The Codex therefore has no connection with the Archives et Bibliothèque du Palais de Monaco.

<sup>1</sup>J.C.M. Van Winden, 'An Early Christian Philosopher; Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho, Caps. I - IX. p. 5: 'A second manuscript, a long time in the possession of M.T. Fitzroy Fenwick of Thirlstaine House, Cheltenham, seems to be now in the United States' according to information provided by J. Smit Sibinga.

<sup>2</sup>of. A.W.F. Blunt, loc. cit. p. liii refers wrongly to the Codex Monacensis CXXXII in the Royal Library, Munich. I am assured by the librarian (letter: 26.4.73) that this Codex 132 contains no text of Justin.



The comprehensive bibliography of nearly all the editions of Justin Martyr prior to 1914 compiled by E.R. Goodenough<sup>1</sup> must still stand without addition. Maran's text<sup>2</sup> of Justin's works was the best workable edition of his day and for those who followed him. Much of Braun's edition<sup>3</sup> remained worthy of study even after his work was superseded by that of Otto.<sup>4</sup> Otto's edition displayed great accuracy and massive scholarship, forming the basis of all subsequent editions.

J.P. Migne included the works of Justin in his enormous work, basing his text on that of Maran.<sup>5</sup> The Apologies of D.G. Kruger<sup>6</sup> must be noticed because the text was employed by the Rev. A.W.F. Blunt whom we shall note below. G. Rauschen edited the two Apologies the text of which is excellent.<sup>7</sup> I have looked at, but not used the Greek text and French translation of L. Pautigny.<sup>8</sup> I have also examined the text of the Dialogue with Trypho in the admirable work of G. Archambault.<sup>9</sup> I have employed the work of A.W.F. Blunt,<sup>10</sup> not only because of his excellent text of the Apologies, but also to consult him on many points requiring elucidation.

<sup>1</sup>E.R. Goodenough, The Theology of Justin Martyr, Jena (1923), repr. Amsterdam (1968), pp. 296-297.

<sup>2</sup>P. Maranus, Opera. Gr. et Lat. Paris (1742), repr. Venice (1747).

<sup>3</sup>J.W.J. Braunius, Apologies, Bonn (1830, 1860).

<sup>4</sup>J.C.T. Otto, Opera. Gr. et Lat. Jena (1842), 2nd ed. (1847-1850), 3rd ed. (1876-1881), repr. 1968.

<sup>5</sup>Migne, Patrol. Graec. VI Paris (1857); cf. F. Cavallera. Migne, Patrol. curs. compl. Series Graeca, Indices digessit, Paris (1912).

<sup>6</sup>D.G. Krüger, Die Apologien Justins, 3rd ed. Leipzig (1896), 3rd ed. Tübingen (1915), repr. 1968.

<sup>7</sup>G. Rauschen, Apologiae duae. In: Florilegium patristicum, Bonn (1904).

<sup>8</sup>L. Pautigny, Apologies. Texte grec., trad. franc., Textes et documents pour l'étude historique du Christ. Vol. I, Paris (1904).

<sup>9</sup>G. Archambault, Dial. avec Tryph. Texte grec., trad. franc., Textes et documents pour l'étude historique du christian, Vols. 8, 11., Paris (1909).

<sup>10</sup>A.W.F. Blunt, The Apologies of Justin Martyr. Cambridge Patristic Texts, ed. A.J. Mason Cambridge, 1911. His edition follows mainly the text of Krüger (vid. supr.).



I did not have access to the text of J.M. Pfattisch, noted favourably as it has been by many reviewers of the day.<sup>1</sup> I have looked at, but felt no need to have extensive recourse to the work of Goodspeed.<sup>2</sup>

I have unreserved praise for the straightforward text of D.R. Bueno.<sup>3</sup> I have used this constantly and without frustration. The text of Justin's First Apology edited by K. Bayer<sup>4</sup> was not an improvement on Bueno's work. The text of J.C.M. Van Winden proved invaluable for many points of exegesis, but its limitations were obvious in that it was a text and commentary of only the first nine chapters of the Dialogue.<sup>5</sup>

Monographs of recent years devoted to an assessment of Justin's theology are worthy works of scholarship, but are few. We need to assess the value of three only since without exception they share a common view of Justin that he was heir to a single orthodox tradition.

<sup>1</sup>J.M. Pfattisch, Justinus' Apologien, Munster (1912).

<sup>2</sup>E.J. Goodspeed, Die altesten Apologeten. Texte mit kurzen Einleitungen. Gottingen (1914).

<sup>3</sup>D.R. Bueno. Padres Apologistas Griegos, Madrid (1954).

<sup>4</sup>K. Bayer, Die erste Apologie, Munich (1966).

<sup>5</sup>J.C.M. Van Winden, An Early Christian Philosopher: Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho, Caps. I - IX. Intro., Text and Commentary, Leiden (1971).

The 1923 Jena edition of The Theology of Justin Martyr by E.R. Goodenough<sup>1</sup> was received with great favour by the critics of the day.<sup>2</sup> Goodenough judged the worth of Justin as he related to an orthodox tradition which he felt had preceded Justin. He claimed, soundly, that the Prophets and Christ, in their perfect harmony, constitute the True Philosophy. But he was wrong in claiming that such a point of view is utterly inexplicable if Justin was a Greek in his thinking who never really understood the Christianity to which he had been converted, and who was trying to reconcile a mere Faith with the rationality of the Schools. Justin clearly understood what he was trying to teach and therefore by implication understood what he had received; but this is a long way from saying that he had received an orthodox faith understood and uniformly accepted by the Christian congregations of the day everywhere. Goodenough's warm view of Justin's chief joy in Christianity is derived from the fact that what Justin teaches was not his own, but was the revealed and accepted Faith.<sup>3</sup>

It is the considered view of the present writer that this is a traditional view of Justin, but that it is not supported by analysis of the facts. It is claimed in this thesis that Justin received not the one accepted Faith, but only one of the accepted Faiths and that his version of Christianity, if not entirely his own, was one of several.

Goodenough claimed that the Christianity of Justin's day had already its powerful tradition of orthodoxy. This is not true. Theophilus of Antioch cannot be called as a witness to this accepted orthodoxy. Tatian was a Gnostic. The Shepherd of Hermas does not mention the name of Jesus. Neither does Theophilus nor Athenagoras. We have no reason to believe that the Gnostic writers of the second century A.D. were any less acceptable as orthodox than were those described usually as Apologists.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>E.R. Goodenough, The Theology of Justin Martyr Jena, 1923; repr.1968. (Amsterdam)

<sup>2</sup>e.g. R.P. Casey J.T.S. XXV (1924), pp. 419-422.

<sup>3</sup>op.cit. p.293.

<sup>4</sup>cf. C.F.D. Moule, The Birth of the N.T. (1962), 153 ff.



Goodenough claimed that Justin believed in a personal Father. This is simply not the case. Much of what we believe about our Lord was barely half understood by Justin. Our author is completely confused by the Holy Spirit as was Theophilus. Justin has only a hazy idea of the cause of a need for salvation. He had no concept of sin except as disobedience. The absence of any conviction about Redemption is as marked as his complete ignorance of a loving relationship between the Son and the Father. Goodenough's acceptance of Justin's 'orthodoxy' will not stand up to scrutiny.

The claim of L.W. Barnard<sup>1</sup> that 'the heart of Christianity for Justin, was God's care and love for man revealed in the Bible and supremely in Jesus Christ' is simply without substance. Christ, the Incarnate Logos, was an Example and a Teacher who was sent by God the Creator to reveal man's disobedience. There is no evidence in Justin for God's loving care for human souls or for a belief that a relationship between God and individual men can develop into a deep meaningful sonship. L.W. Barnard believes that Justin lies in 'the main stream of the Christian tradition and not on the outskirts'. This is not only non-proven, but even the reverse of what is true. There seems to have been no main stream in Justin's day and he was fumbling his way forward just as Theophilus or Tatian and was even less far along the road to a concept of orthodoxy (in terms of acceptability to the later Fathers) than Athenagoras. Justin knows nothing of the Pauline idea of 'being in Christ'. His concept of baptism as  $\phi\upsilon\tau\iota\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma$  is far from the Pauline 'dying and rising with Christ'. Barnard is less kind to the facts when he claims that Justin was 'loyal to the past and to the Church'.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> L.W. Barnard, Justin Martyr, His Life and Thought, C.U.P. (1967), p.170. The reviews were uniformly favourable e.g. A Graham, Expository Times, lxxviii, No.11 (Aug.) 1967; R.P.C. Hanson, J.T.S. n.s. 19 (1968), p.297; J.S.A. Cunningham Vig. Christ. 25 (1971), pp.148-149.

<sup>2</sup> op.cit. p.171.

One cannot dismiss Goodenough or Barnard in a cavalier manner. Both scholars quite rightly acknowledge our enormous debt to Justin. They point with exquisite detail to Justin's immense range of exposition. They demonstrated that there was scarcely any aspect of Christian thinking or practice which he did not allude to or describe. Both scholars demonstrate how Justin acknowledged Jesus Christ as the only Son of God, who was born of a virgin, suffered at the hands of Pilate, and was crucified, who died and was buried. After his descent into Hell, he rose and went up to His Father in Heaven and from there, He will return in glory as judge.

All this E.F. Osborn<sup>1</sup> says too. But he sees clearly that Justin had blind spots on subordinationism<sup>2</sup> for example. We can agree with Osborn that Justin's complex response to objections make his works more than a response. Justin states with clarity and conviction what he believes the gospel is.<sup>3</sup> Osborn's verdict is that the range of Justin's exposition is immense and we concur with his verdict. But immense exposition does not make Justin, as Osborn claims, one of the most original thinkers Christianity produced.<sup>4</sup> It is the view of the present writer that far from being original, Justin stood in a line of orthodoxy, having predecessors and successors. But whereas, Goodenough, Barnard and Osborn think in terms of one, single orthodoxy at the centre of a mass of heresies, this writer believes that Justin demonstrates only one of many equally accepted, equally acceptable 'orthodoxies' of his day, which gradually were rationalized or distilled after decades of argument and apologetic into a basis for a Nicene Creed.

<sup>1</sup>E.F. Osborn, Justin Martyr, Tübingen (1973).

<sup>2</sup>ibid. p. 200.

<sup>3</sup>ibid.

<sup>4</sup>ibid. p. 201.



Justin showed a remarkable inaccuracy in his citations of the LXX and the N.T. Where he quotes from 'the Memoirs', he makes no effort to interpret his quotations, but quotes them in evidence of the truth of the O.T. prophecies. We know less about Middle Platonism than we would wish; certainly we know next to nothing about those philosophers who were Justin's immediate predecessors. It is too bland of Goodenough, Barnard and Osborn to place Justin in a prominent place in a single line of the historical development of orthodox Christianity. Christians before Justin believed that God was creator, judge and saviour, to use Osborn's phraseology. But Osborn himself finds that Justin describes God in Platonist terms.<sup>1</sup> Even where Osborn looks at passages in Justin where God, as creator and judge, forgives the sin of men of all nations, he fails to observe how much the saving act of Christ depends on the exorcistic nature of the physical cross and blood.<sup>2</sup>

Osborn palpably errs when he specifically states that the titles of God as father and maker of all things are not derived from biblical sources and yet when he instances how the concept of divine fatherhood is traceable through Posidonius and Middle Platonists, Philo, Numenius and the Hermetic writings, can still conclude that the apologists make use of the name because it is both commonplace and common ground. Far easier can it be said that Justin was a Middle Platonist and that he saw God in these terms.

J. Lebreton saw Justin as the only Apologist who explicitly identified the Logos and Jesus Christ. This identification caused him concern.<sup>3</sup> This unresolved contrast between Justin's Stoic ideas and the incarnation is seen by Osborn as a clarification of the magnitude of the event.<sup>4</sup> But such a comment does not explain the dilemma.

<sup>1</sup> ibid. p.17. God is seen by Justin as ἀνευδής or ἀπροόδης ; this idea appears in Plato, Tim. 33 D and Albinus, Didask. X, 3 (ed. C. Fr. Hermann, Platonis Dialogi, vol. vi, Leipzig, 1853, pp. 152-189).

<sup>2</sup> e.g. Osborn, op. cit. pp. 18-19; cf. Dialoxi, 4.

<sup>3</sup> J. Lebreton, Histoire du dogme de la trinité des origines au concile de Nicée, Paris (1928), p. 434 et pass.

<sup>4</sup> Osborn, op. cit. p. 42.

Justin does not deny the fullness of the incarnation - Christ is  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ ,  $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$  and  $\psi\upsilon\chi\acute{\eta}$  - but Osborn claims his formulation of the Logos doctrine shows how later and more careful thought was to find difficulty.<sup>1</sup>

Before further observations are made, it is essential for us to make a statement which is as clear as possible so that we may show where we believe the philosophical convictions of Justin lay.

In his life of Plato, Diogenes Laertius defines a dialogue as a discourse arising from question and answer concerning some subject of philosophical and political concern with the appropriate regard for the characters of men who are introduced and the treatment of the theme by the choice of words. Dialectic is the technique of discoursing through which we critically refute or establish a point from the questions and answers of those who are discoursing.<sup>2</sup> He analyses the types of Dialogue; one subdivision of one type of dialogue is that which aims at victory in controversy as a result of raising critical objections.<sup>3</sup> Justin's Dialogue with Trypho is representative of this kind of classical dialogue which after a long and almost complete absence from Hellenistic literature reappeared with Plutarch and Lucian. Justin's Dialogue, like the best of Plato's, possesses considerable depth and displays a rhetorical power, illuminating the thought patterns of the time.

The Dialogue with Trypho observes the structural conventions of Platonic dialogues and may even be compared with Plato's Republic. In the Republic, Socrates is introduced as walking in the Peiraeus; Justin in the Dialogue is shown as taking a stroll in the Xystus, perhaps at Ephesus.<sup>4</sup> Just as Socrates is greeted by his friends Polemarchus and others, so Justin receives the salutations of Trypho and his friends.

<sup>1</sup> ibid. p.37.

<sup>2</sup> Diog. Laert. iii, 48 (Loeb).

<sup>3</sup> ibid. iii, 49.

<sup>4</sup> Euseb. Hist. Eccles. iv, 18 (Loeb).



Courtesies and pleasantries are exchanged in both dialogues. In both dialogues, the parties move off, Justin and Trypho to a seat nearby, Socrates and Polemarchus to the house of the latter. There is a preliminary discourse on an introductory theme in both dialogues; in the Republic, we are treated to a critique of the compensations of old age, in the Dialogue a quest through the schools of philosophy is conducted. In both dialogues, the convention of introducing an old man is observed, in the Republic as a means whereby Cephalus might guide an inquiry into the theme of Justice, in the Dialogue where the old man, unnamed by Justin, might set the scene for the Christian apology to follow. Trypho's friends laugh and shout in an unseemly manner at the outset and find themselves so unable to continue the discourse that they leave. Thrasyarchus in the Republic shows his anger and then guffaws. A discussion on whether Glaucon, Adeimantus, Simmias and Cebes were actual personalities voicing actual thoughts verbatim and an investigation into the actual identity of Tryphon are not essential to the thoughts which Justin inserts into his share of the Dialogue. In the last resort, they are all men of straw used by their authors to lead the argument along. But they are essential to the kind of dialectic which Diogenes Laertius describes. Trypho is a Jew who incorporates the noblest characteristics of two schools of Judaistic thought; he demonstrates his rabbinical training in the Scriptures and his familiarity with the scope of Hellenistic philosophy. The immortal person of Socrates is the mouthpiece of Plato too. But in both dialogues, we have a positive and dogmatic discourse of the author's philosophy; in both we are faced with an idealized dramatization of a conversation with men and youths, this providing a framework for the authors' affirmations.

Justin gives us in some detail the outlines of his own intellectual pilgrimage. He tells us in the second chapter of his Dialogue that there are good reasons why philosophy has become many-headed. His intellectual honesty and his philosophical detachment are nowhere more apparent than where he expressly describes philosophy as the greatest possession.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Dial. ii, 1.



Justin studied at first with a Stoic philosopher. In the highly developed system of Stoicism in post Aristotelian days, we see either a materialization of the divine or a spiritualization of matter.<sup>1</sup> But antiquity saw in Stoicism a clear case of materialism leaving no place for any spiritual principles.<sup>2</sup> It was not surprising therefore that the reason for Justin's having forsaken the Stoics was that he was not able to acquire further knowledge of God.<sup>3</sup> His Stoic mentor had no knowledge of God and said such instruction was unnecessary.<sup>4</sup> There were unsatisfied questions in Justin's mind about the nature of divinity and he continued his search elsewhere.

He took himself to a Peripatetic. It is noteworthy that Justin left this man not because he was dissatisfied with the progress of his Aristotelian studies, but because he was asked a fee.<sup>5</sup> Some of the Sophists who, as itinerant teachers offered as subjects of instruction the art of obtaining material success in life, sometimes attempted like Protagoras to teach 'virtue'. From the second century A.D. in the Roman Empire, the name of sophist was applied to teachers of rhetoric which was virtually identical with Higher Education. After this unfortunate experience Justin was interviewed by a Pythagorean.<sup>6</sup> A revived form of Pythagoreanism began to influence the thinking of philosophers in the first century B.C. and this school of thought was one of the primary causes for the emphasis upon the transcendence and remoteness of the Highest Principle, so cardinal a doctrine of Middle Platonism.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup>A.H. Armstrong, Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy, p.124.

<sup>2</sup>ibid. p.125.

<sup>3</sup>Dial. ii,3.

<sup>4</sup>ibid.

<sup>5</sup>ibid.

<sup>6</sup>ibid. ii,4.

<sup>7</sup>The earliest account of the revival of Pythagoreanism is to be found in Diog. Laertius, viii, 25-35 where the author preserves the record of what Alexander Polyhistor claimed he found ἐν Πυθαγορικοῖς ὑπομνήμασιν.

Justin, with some reluctance it might seem, was not able to prosecute his studies with his Pythagorean tutor largely because he had insufficient time to acquire the primary disciplines of astronomy, geometry and music which would wean the soul from sensible objects.<sup>1</sup> Philo advocated that these disciplines should be introductory studies to great themes.<sup>2</sup> Clement of Alexandria wanted these subjects to be a preliminary condition for true γνῶσις.<sup>3</sup> But there was evidence for Justin in Plato that these subjects were not essential for higher studies.<sup>4</sup> Up to this point there is no disillusionment with Greek philosophy in the mind of Justin. At no time has he said that his Greek teachers were of no worth. The Stoic philosophy had no room for God; the Aristotelian, whatever truths he might have conveyed, asked a fee and outraged Justin; the Pythagorean would have taken too long before getting down to essentials.

Finally, Justin spent his time with a Platonist and at this point he becomes fervent in his convictions for καί με ἤρει εὐόσρα ἡ τῶν ἀσωμάτων νόσις, καὶ ἡ θεωρία τῶν ἰδεῶν ἀνεπτέρου μοι τὴν φρόνησιν and in this statement<sup>5</sup>, Justin demonstrates his sound grasp of Platonist principles. Van Winden has analysed the first chapters of the Dialogue in minute detail and has left no-one in doubt that Justin is nothing if not a profound Platonist.<sup>6</sup> Such was the impact of Platonist thought on Justin that he admits to complacency and the beginnings of a closed mind; intellectual laziness, βλακεία, led him to believe that he could look on God.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Dial. ii,4.

<sup>2</sup>Philo, de congress. 12 ff. (Loeb); cf. Albinus, Didask. vii.

<sup>3</sup>Clem. Strom. VI,X,64 (Migne).

<sup>4</sup>e.g. Plat. Philebus, 55-56; Protag. 318e.

<sup>5</sup>Dial. ii,6.

<sup>6</sup>J.C.M. Van Winden, An Early Christian Philosopher; Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho, passim.

<sup>7</sup>Dial. ii,6.



At this point, he met a venerable old man who introduced him to Christianity with the help of philosophical arguments. Some of these arguments, accepted readily by Justin, were Aristotelian.<sup>1</sup> For example, the old man leads Justin to see that souls do not transmigrate into other bodies. According to Aristotle, the soul is intimately united with the body and he rejected Plato's conception of the soul as a separate entity destined for a bodiless existence, but designed to exist in a succession of different bodies.

The Platonists in the time of Justin were eclectic. They accepted Peripatetic logic, for example, and they found little similar to this in the works of Plato which they possessed. The principle of a completely Transcendent One they took from the neo-pythagorean schools. But for all that, the Middle Platonists accepted as 'orthodoxy' the works of Plato, but borrowing from other schools, notably the Stoics, whenever it suited them. There was not therefore a single, coherent system of 'Middle Platonism', but elaboration of the different schools with the principal contribution being made by Platonism.

For example, Philosophy, according to Justin ἐπιστήμη ἐστὶ τοῦ ὄντος καὶ τοῦ ἀληθοῦς ἐπίγνωσις.<sup>2</sup> Later Justin refers to τὸ ὄν ... ὃ τῶν νοητῶν πάντων ἐστὶν αἴτιον.<sup>3</sup> This can be seen by τὸ τοῦ νοῦ ὅμῃμα.<sup>4</sup> But Justin's definition of God is τὸ κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ καὶ ὡσαύτως αἰεὶ ἔχεν καὶ τοῦ εἶναι πᾶσι τοῖς ἄλλοις αἴτιον.<sup>5</sup> The influence of Plato, especially the Phaedo, is most marked.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> cf. R.M. Grant, 'Aristotle and the Conversion of Justin, J.T.S. n.s. VII (1956), pp. 246-8.

<sup>2</sup> Dial. iii, 4.

<sup>3</sup> ibid. iv, 1.

<sup>4</sup> ibid.

<sup>5</sup> ibid. iii, 5.

<sup>6</sup> e.g. Plato, Phaed. 66D; Repub. 509B; Symp. 211A.

The expression  $\tau\acute{o} \acute{o}\nu$  is not frequent among the Stoics. We meet it in the Timaeus.<sup>1</sup> But in referring it to the Middle Platonist period and to a Transcendent God, we can find copious references. Stobaeus refers to the statement of Archytas of the 1st century B.C. that there were two principles and a moving cause which was God.<sup>2</sup> Syrianus tells us that this cause was before causes in the mind of Archytas.<sup>3</sup> Here in the first century B.C. is the beginning of that extreme transcendental view of the first Principle described as  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\epsilon\tau\eta\tau\omicron\nu$  and the prior cause of all  $\nu\omicron\eta\tau\acute{\alpha}$ . These are precisely the views of Justin outlined above.

The idea that  $\tau\acute{o} \acute{o}\nu$  is one of the elements in Middle Platonist first principles is described by Simplicius who gives us an account of Moderatus' theory.<sup>4</sup> Plutarch returns to the ineffable, unutterable, nameless nature of true deity in referring to the only permissible form of address to the god at Delphi, giving this as 'You are' as the only befitting name,  $\tau\eta\nu\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \acute{\epsilon}\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota\ \pi\rho\omicron\beta\alpha\gamma\acute{o}\rho\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu$ .<sup>5</sup> Furthermore, he says that things of the sensible world are never stable and therefore are not in the full sense. God alone who is always the same, is Real Being and is that which is eternal, without beginning and without end, to which no length of time brings change.<sup>6</sup> But God is and under these conditions, we ought to greet Him with the words, 'You are'; or even ... 'You are One'.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> e.g. Plato, Tim. 27.

<sup>2</sup> Archytas, II  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\acute{\alpha}\nu$  ap. Stob. Ecl. 1, p.278ff. (ed. Wachsmuth).

<sup>3</sup> Syrianus in Arist. Metaph. XIV, the beginning (Mullach II, p.117).

<sup>4</sup> Simplicius. Phys. p. 230, 41-231, 25 (Diels). Moderatus of Gades (c. A.D. 50-100) tried to derive the main principles of Plato's metaphysics from Pythagorean doctrine (vid. PW XV. 2378).

<sup>5</sup> Plut. De E apud Delphos, 392 A.

<sup>6</sup> ibid. 392 E.

<sup>7</sup> ibid. 393 A - B.

Albinus states that the first principle is grasped by the mind alone.<sup>1</sup> This first principle has neither name, colour or size if we are to accept Maximus of Tyre.<sup>2</sup> The supreme Being of Justin has affinity with the τὸ ὄν of Numenius.<sup>3</sup> In fact, Justin's description of God as τὸ κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ καὶ ὡδαύτως αἰετῶν may very well have originated in the same sources as those of Numenius (150-200 A.D.) where τὸ ὄν is defined as ἕστηκός ἐστι κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ ἔχον αἰεὶ καὶ ὡδαύτως.<sup>4</sup> Apuleius (circ. 125 A.D.) describes the first God in terms each one of which is paralleled in Justin: unus et solus summus ille ultramundanus incorporeus, quem patrem et architectum huius divini orbis superius ostendimus.<sup>5</sup>

It is this philosophical background which we must constantly keep in mind when we seek to define Justin's theological categories after he had seemingly moved from his classical position.

<sup>1</sup>Albinus, Didask. x: ἀρρητος δ' ἐστὶ καὶ τῷ νῷ μόνῳ λεπτός.

<sup>2</sup>Max. Tyr. Philosoph. xi, 90 (Hobein).

<sup>3</sup>Numen. Frag. 5 = 5250 (ed. E. des Places).

<sup>4</sup>ibid. Frag. 5 = 526a.

<sup>5</sup>Apul. de Plat. I, 11 (Thomas).



### The Father

An essential term in the equation of the relationship of the Father to the Son is the precise meaning which the Father had for Justin. Certainly the idea of the Father was descriptive of God. There were many among Justin's contemporaries who dissociated the concept of Fatherhood from the Godhead. We must ask if any of these influenced Justin. Certainly such beliefs existed in many Hellenistic systems of thought. If Justin associated the attributes of Fatherhood with God, from where did he obtain his belief? What were the influences upon him? Did the concept of Fatherhood express for Justin a simple physical or metaphysical fact of paternity or generation or did it express a more subtle relationship, providing a moral link of love for, in this context, a Son just as the Fatherhood of God in the O.T. was based upon a covenant and a providential concern for the sons of Israel? Was the Fatherhood of God, in short, founded in God's love, infinitely given and spontaneously offered? This chapter seeks to provide some of the answers to these obvious questions.

A contemporary view of post-exilic Judaism maintains that it was distinguished not only by a dominating monotheism, but also by a conviction of God's utter transcendence which had the effect of exalting Him far and away beyond the world He had once created. Discussed and speculated upon in Rabbinic exposition, Yahweh tended to surrender all His anthropomorphic traits and to be considered in a far more spiritualized and transcendent way.<sup>1</sup> God is called 'the God of Heaven', 'the Lord', 'the Most High', 'the Almighty' and so on and we are invited to accept that a more abstract One has taken over from the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. The orthodox used names like 'the Blessed', 'the Name', 'the Eternal' and 'Heaven' as substitutes for the name of God since it appeared out of the question that this utterly exalted God could ever be in close touch with the world of matter. The Jews bridged this abyss by using intermediaries and hypostases like 'the Word', 'the Shekinah', 'Glory', 'Wisdom', 'Torah' and so on.

<sup>1</sup> C. Guingnebert, The Jewish World in the Time of Jesus, p. 89 (with bibliography). D.S. Russell, The Jews from Alexander to Herod, p.132.

It would appear that this is a harsh view given little support by contemporary Jewish scholars. If these terms for intermediaries under the influence of alien cults crept into Jewish writings, it is denied that they ever had as much significance to a Rabbi as they certainly did to early Christian philosophers.<sup>1</sup> God to the Jews was reached not by metaphysical speculation, but through experience. Although to Jethro, the Lord is greater than all the Gods,<sup>2</sup> there is no other God in all the earth for Naaman, but in Israel.<sup>3</sup> Rahab located God both in heaven and in the earth beneath.<sup>4</sup> Rabbinic teaching claimed that there was no other place which means that even the empty space is full of God.<sup>5</sup>

Justin is quite adamant with Trypho that God the Father and Creator of all cannot possibly appear in any theophany.<sup>6</sup> ὁ γὰρ ἀρχηγὸς πατὴρ καὶ κύριος τῶν πάντων οὔτε παρ' ἀφικταὶ οὔτε περιπατεῖ οὔτε καθεύδει οὔτε ἀνίσταται, ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ χώρᾳ ὅπου ποτέ, μένει.<sup>7</sup> If ever this seems to happen in the O.T., the Person who appears or speaks is none other than the Logos, the second God. This is the constant theme of Justin. God has His location, but He is ὁ ὑπὲρ κόσμον θεὸς ὑπὲρ ὃν ἄλλος οὐκ ἔστι.<sup>8</sup> and no-one with the smallest intelligence will dare to claim that the Maker and Father of all καταλίποντα τὰ ὑπὲρ οὐρανὸν πάντα, ἐν ὀλίγῳ γῆς μορίῳ πεφάνθαι.<sup>9</sup> This is a far cry from Rabbinic claims scattered

<sup>1</sup> e.g. S. Schechter, Aspects of Rabbinic Theology, 21 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Exod. xviii, 11.

<sup>3</sup> II Kings, v, 15.

<sup>4</sup> Josh. ii, 11; cf. Deut. iv, 39.

<sup>5</sup> Deut. R. 2, 27; cf. Mechilta, 59a.

<sup>6</sup> Dial. lvi, 1; lx, 2.

<sup>7</sup> e.g. ibid. cxxvii, 2.

<sup>8</sup> ibid. lx, 5.

<sup>9</sup> ibid. lx, 2.



through their literature e.g. God is 'the only one of the world',<sup>1</sup> 'the righteous one of the world',<sup>2</sup> 'the space of the world'.<sup>3</sup> For Justin it is the Angel of God who publishes to men the commands of the Father and Maker of all things.<sup>4</sup>

Many terms for God employed by the later biblical writers place God above the world and name Him, 'the heaven'.<sup>5</sup> This is not surprising in view of the fact that throughout the Middle East at that period the place of the highest god was the heavens. Various Syrian Gods were identified interpretatione Romana with Jupiter Optimus Maximus who masqueraded under all the attributes of the sky-god Zeus. There is good reason to believe that the attribute  $\text{Ὠψιβητος}$ , 'the Most High' applied originally more in a spatial sense than in a metaphorical way.<sup>6</sup> Like Yahweh  $\text{Ὠψιβητος}$ , Jupiter Heliopolitanus from the great temple at Baalbek between the mountain ranges of Libanus and Antilibanus was a God most High, a solar deity to be precise.<sup>7</sup> Jupiter Dolichenus, a Hittite god surviving into Graeco-Roman times, was regarded as a sky-god, 'Preserver of the Whole Sky', 'the Sun pre-eminent'.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Gen. R. 21, 5.

<sup>2</sup> Yoma, 37a.

<sup>3</sup> Gen. R. 68, 9.

<sup>4</sup> Dial. lx, 3.

<sup>5</sup> e.g. I Macc. iii, 50; iv, 10, 24, 40; xii, 15; xvi, 3; cf. 'the kingdom of heaven', Matt. iii, 2 et passim; cf. Dan. iv, 23. cf. Iupiter Caelius (CIL, VI, 334); Caelum (ILS, 4832); Caelus Aeternus (CIL, VI, 83; ibid. 84). cf. Pirke Aboth, i, 3: 'the fear of heaven = of God.'

<sup>6</sup> Zeus, ii, 876 ff. For examples of the use of  $\text{Ὠψιβητος}$  in cult attributive titles, see F. Cumont, Paul-Wiss. ix, 444-450 s.v.  $\text{Ὠψιβητος}$ .

<sup>7</sup> Zeus, ii, 567 ff.

<sup>8</sup> ibid. ii, 604 ff. Dolichenus penetrated as far west as the military district of N. Britain (R.G. Collingwood, The Roman Inscriptions of Britain, Nos. 1219-1220, p. 401).

How in fact does Justin interpret ὁ ὕψιστος? He uses the word some seventeen times. Only once does it occur outside the Dialogue and then in a form of quotation from the Gospels.<sup>1</sup> Justin also includes the word in quotations from the LXX<sup>2</sup> and Luke i, 35. In all these quotations and in the remaining instances where ὁ ὕψιστος is used, Justin is referring to the Supreme God and he uses the word as an appellation of God without additions of any kind. 'Saints of the Most High',<sup>3</sup> 'Melchisedek, Priest of the Highest',<sup>4</sup> 'Son of the Highest',<sup>5</sup> 'Sons of the Highest',<sup>6</sup> 'children of the Highest',<sup>7</sup> and 'power of the Highest'.<sup>8</sup>

The word ὁ ὕψιστος was used to describe divinity among pagans and Christians alike. It was used by the Greeks to describe Zeus.<sup>9</sup> At Thebes there was a temple of Zeus Hypsistos at the gates of the city and the gates were accordingly named ὕψιστοι.<sup>10</sup> It is a familiar word in inscriptions.<sup>11</sup> An inscription dedicated to an anonymous god ὁ ὕψιστος found at Tanais was once thought to refer to Sabazios; later study found that the cult object carrying the inscription, possessed characteristic aspects of Yahweh.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>1</sup>The quotation seems to combine Luke, i, 31, 32 with Matt. i, 20, 21.

<sup>2</sup>Dial. cxxxi, 1 = Deut. xxxii, 7; Dial. xxii, 9 = Psalm, xlix (1), 14; Dial. xxxi, 5 = Dan. vii, 9 - 28.

<sup>3</sup>Dial. xxxi, 5 = Dan. vii, 9 - 28.

<sup>4</sup>Dial. xix, 4; xxxiii, 2; cf. cxiii, 5.

<sup>5</sup>I Apol. xxxiii, 5 = Luke, i, 32 and Matt. i, 21.

<sup>6</sup>Dial. cxxiv, 1, 4.

<sup>7</sup>Dial. cxxiv, 2.

<sup>8</sup>Dial. c, 5 = Luke, i, 35.

<sup>9</sup>Pind. Nem. 1, 60; Aesch. Eum. 28; cf. Ζηὺς ὕψιστος ἑβραῖος; Soph. Philoc. 1289; Tac. Hist. v, 4 where the God of the Jews is Saturn and as the highest of the planets, Saturn is an object of worship for the Jews. A.B. Cook, Zeus, ii, 876 ff.

<sup>10</sup>Paus. ix, 8, 5; Stat. Theb. viii, 356.

<sup>11</sup>See A.B. Cook, Zeus, ii, 876 ff.

<sup>12</sup>L'Année Epigraphique (1966), 373, p. 104.



There was a large colony of Jews at Tanais. Jewish ideas were incorporated into some frescoes at Rome and these appeared with an inscription bearing the name of Sabazius.<sup>1</sup> At Delos were found two votive inscriptions dated to the second century B.C. which recorded prayers to the θεὸς Ὑψίστος for speedy vengeance on behalf of two Jewish women who had been killed by violence or witchcraft.<sup>2</sup> The Jewish influence is obvious. A number of bilingual inscriptions from Palmyra associate Zeus Hypsistos and the God 'whose name is blessed forever'.<sup>3</sup> This was a non-classical cult, but bears the unmistakable marks of Jewish influence.<sup>4</sup> The word Ὑψίστος occurs in Jewish inscriptions in the Crimea and the Aegean.<sup>5</sup>

F. Cumont argued (unconvincingly in the opinion of the present writer) that 'Hypsistos' was a customary title of the god of the Jews whenever it occurred in Asia.<sup>6</sup> He notes an inscription bearing a dedication to Ἀττεῖ Ὑψίστῳ.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> CIL, vi, 142 = ILS, 3961

<sup>2</sup> A.B. Cook, op. cit. ii, 880-881, no. 19.

<sup>3</sup> ibid. 885 f. CIG, iii, no. 4503.

<sup>4</sup> Syria (1933), 249 f; CIG, ibid.

<sup>5</sup> J.B. Frey, Corp. Inscr. Iud. i, 690, 725, 727-30. See H. Chadwick, Early Christian Thought and the Classical Tradition, p. 126 (with an extremely valuable note which illustrates Ὑψίστος with full refs.); C. Guignebert, The Jewish World in the Time of Jesus, p. 241; A. Deissman, Light from the Ancient East, (Eng. trans.), pp. 423-425; cf. F. Cumont, Supplement à la Revue de l'instruction publique en Belgique (Brussels, 1897), pp. 1-15, s.v. Hypsistos; Paul.-Wiss. ix, 444-450, s.v. Ὑψίστος; A.B. Cook, Zeus, ii, Appendix B, pp. 876-890; R. Cagnat, Inscriptiones Graecae ad res Romanas pertinentes, i, 300 ff. nos. 915-921.

<sup>6</sup> F. Cumont, Les Religions Orientales dans le Paganisme Romain, p. 59.

<sup>7</sup> ibid. CIL, vi, 50 = CIG, xiv, 1018.

He believed that Hebraic monotheism had influenced the mysteries even of the Great Mother and indeed other cults during the Alexandrian period. The large number of Jewish colonies dispersed around the shores and harbours of the Mediterranean as a result of their determined proselytizing spirit, must have imposed some of their ideas on the pagans around them. This is undeniable as a general statement of Jewish influence. The corpus of Sibylline oracles is an excellent example of this spirit and influence. If a Jewish writer could usurp the authority of the classical Sibyl, he might exert a greater persuasion in proselytizing by using verses composed in the Sibylline manner. Some of the extant Sibylline verses are Jewish, some are Jewish works remodelled by a Christian, other books are Jewish Christian according to Daniélou.<sup>1</sup> The collections of magical papyri also demonstrate that plagiarism of theological ideas from the Jews was common. For example, the names of Iao (= Yahweh) and Sabaoth are placed side by side with other gods and goddesses.<sup>2</sup> Hypsistos Theos occurs on a magical papyrus in company with Helios.<sup>3</sup> An invocation has been found in a papyrus, to great Zeus Iao, Michael who holdest heaven, and Gabriel.<sup>4</sup> But this does not support an argument that Hypsistos always shows Jewish influence.

<sup>1</sup>J. Daniélou, The Theology of Jewish Christianity, p.17; R.H. Charles, The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the O.T., II, 368 ff.

<sup>2</sup>W.L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, pp. 208-211. Greek Papyri in the British Museum, i (ed. F.C. Kenyon), 46, 46, p.66. But H. Chadwick (op. cit. p. 126) thinks that the epithet Hypsistos is not used as a proper name in invocations preserved in the magical papyrus.

<sup>3</sup>A.B. Cook, op. cit. ii, Appendix B, p. 882, n.21.

<sup>4</sup>ibid. i, p.233.



As a result of a false derivation, the Phrygian god Sabazius was identified with Yahweh Sabaoth. The LXX reading of  $\text{Κύριος Σαβαώθ}$ <sup>1</sup> has been equated with  $\text{Κύριος Σαβάζιος}$ .<sup>2</sup> The supreme god in most of these cults referred to had his seat in the highest regions and this physical fact was expressed by hypsisistos although the title also described majesty.<sup>3</sup> The Egyptians sometimes identified Osiris with the God of the Jews and Hypsisistos appears on an inscription in company with Serapis.<sup>4</sup> The Latin equivalent exsuperantissimus certainly does not betray a Semitic origin<sup>5</sup>, but rather the reverse.<sup>6</sup>

The adjective hypsisistos appears with Mithras Helios from a Dolichenum in Syria<sup>7</sup> and again on a similar inscription in Phoenicia.<sup>8</sup> Neither shows Jewish influence. A.T. Kraabel discusses Cumont's view stated above that Hypsisistos was the customary title for Yahweh and concluded that there was no overlap of hypsisistos-piety and Western Anatolian Judaism.<sup>9</sup> Kraabel claimed that the word was used by Gentiles as a Greek sounding epithet for native Gods often associated with mountain peaks and heights and because of the Hellenistic desire and need for exalted cosmic deities. Kraabel does not see in hypsisistos any indication of exclusive Hebrew influence. F. Cumont has missed the mark completely and a full study of the available evidence supports the view of Kraabel.

<sup>1</sup> e.g. Is. xxii, 15;  $\text{יהוה}$  and its origin is a matter of conjecture still.

<sup>2</sup> e.g. Val. Max. i, 3, 3.

<sup>3</sup> cf. Matt. xxi, 9; Mark. xi, 10; Luke, xix, 38; cf. Val. Max. ibid.

<sup>4</sup> L'Année Epigraphique (1897), n.86. See Lydus, de Mensibus, iv, 53.

<sup>5</sup> CIL, xi, 2600 = ILS, 3003 (Etruria): IOVI OPTIMO MAXIMO SUMMO EXSUPERANTIS (SIMO); CIL, x, 3805 = ILS, 2997 (Campania in Italy); CIL, iii, 1090 = ILS, 2998 (Apulum in Dacia).

<sup>6</sup> ILS, 3094 (near Utrecht, Holland). Here I.O.M. Exsuperantissimus appears with Sol, Apollo, Luna, Diana, Fortuna, Mars, Victoria, Pax. These might be interpretatione Romana, either Celtic or Teutonic, but not Jewish.

<sup>7</sup> Corp. Inscr. et Mon. Rel. Mithr. i, 70, p.72:  $\text{Διί Ἡλίου | Μίθρα ἁγίου ὑψίστω | ἐπικώω.}$

<sup>8</sup> ibid. i, 72, p. 72:  $\text{[Θε]ῶ ὑψίστω οὐρανίῳ ὑ[πάτω] καὶ Ἡλίου ἀνικήτῳ | [Μί]θρα.}$

<sup>9</sup> A.T. Kraabel, 'hypsisistos and the Synagogue at Sardis', Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies, x (1969), no.1, pp.81-93.

The word suited Justin's purposes as we shall see below. It is a word found in the LXX and it seems a common title of God (with  $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$  and  $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ ) in the literature of the O.T. Certainly in the time of Justin there was a widespread tendency among educated people to extend the distance which separated God and this world of matter. Even from the time of Plato, there was almost an inevitable logic which compelled philosophers to conceive of the Highest Good or the Supreme Being as transcending the boundaries of material space.<sup>1</sup> We have observed at some length how this exaltation of Oriental gods also occurred in cult practice and belief and how the gods of the Dolichenum and Heliopolitan temple were worshipped at the side of Yahweh. The influence of these Asia Minor gods and goddesses on the Jews is constantly evident. But to what extent the Jews in their personal worship exalted Yahweh to a remote, metaphysical transcendence is arguable. It is not denied that this tendency existed; but a study of the sources viewed through Rabbinical eyes prevents one from exaggerating this tendency. Certainly Justin did not over-use the appellative  $\psi\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma$  to help him establish a Supreme One, abstract and transcendent, in the Middle Platonist sense. He used the word seventeen times, never loosely, but invariably in the common patterns of the O.T.<sup>2</sup> Of these usages, five were recognizable quotations.

It is not a common word in the N.T. Where it is applied to God (as opposed to a description of the high heavens), it occurs only in St. Luke<sup>3</sup> apart from a single mention in St. Mark<sup>4</sup> among the synoptic gospel writers.  $\psi\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma$  occurs in a strictly Christian context in some papyri.<sup>5</sup> Perhaps it was a word not strongly favoured by Christians

<sup>1</sup>cf. Plato, Rep. 509B: οὐκ οὐδίας οὐτος τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ, ἀλλ' ἔτι ἐπέκεινα τῆς οὐδίας πρεδβεία καὶ συνάμει ὑπερέχοντος.

<sup>2</sup>See above p.25.

<sup>3</sup>Luke, i, 32, 35, 76; vi, 35; viii, 28.

<sup>4</sup>Mark, v, 7.

<sup>5</sup>Griechische Urkunden der Papyrus-sammlung zu Leipzig, I, ed. L. Metteis (Leipzig 1906), iii,3 (4th cent. A.D.)= Moulton and Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek N.T., p.662; Greek Papyri in the British Museum, iii (edd. F.G. Kenyon; H.I. Bell), p.244, 1244; Papyri Iandanae (edd. E. Schafer; L. Eisner, L. Spohr, G. Speiss (Leipzig, 1912-14), i, 14, 3 = Moulton and Milligan, ibid.



because of its association with high pagan gods. It is favoured by Luke and in his description of the Annunciation (peculiar to Luke), he calls Jesus  $\text{ὁ ὕψιστος}$ .<sup>1</sup> In the Lucan version of the Sermon on the Mount, those who love their enemies will be  $\text{ὡς ὁ ὕψιστος}$ .<sup>2</sup> In the parallel version of St. Matthew, the writer calls the same men  $\text{ὡς τὸ Πατήρ}$ .<sup>3</sup> Would there have been some reason why the word was avoided by the N.T. writers as an appellative of God and would this reason be that God was personal and near, that God was known through personal experience, that He was not in fact aloof and remote in majesty? The writer of Luke was an educated man of literary habits; he betrays elsewhere in his gospel the influence of a contemporary Hellenistic Greek and the influence of the Greek Bible.<sup>4</sup> Hypsistos would be an acceptable word in his world-view.

What did the inter-testamental writers say on the subject of hypsistos? In contrast to the N.T., it is used very frequently in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. The comparison is startling. The Wisdom literature especially is full of references to the Most High.<sup>5</sup> I Enoch abounds with references.<sup>6</sup> In the Hebrew books,  $\text{ὕψιστος}$  is used to translate  $\text{יְהוָה}$ , the latter word being employed throughout the O.T. But in almost every case, it is worthy of comment whenever it occurs in the early books. Its four instances in Genesis occur only in the fourth chapter. This chapter possesses a style and a character unlike the Pentateuch and is probably based on independent sources of events recorded not in Palestine, but in Mesopotamia.

<sup>1</sup> Luke, i, 32.

<sup>2</sup> Luke, vi, 35.

<sup>3</sup> Matt. v, 9.

<sup>4</sup> See R.H. Fuller, The N.T. in Current Study, passim (with full refs.); F.C. Grant, The Gospels, pp. 117-133, 205-206 (with full refs.); A.R.C. Leaney, The Gospel according to St. Luke, passim; cf. Jerome (Migne, Patr. Lat. xxiv, 100): sermo comptior est et secularem redolet eloquentiam.

<sup>5</sup> e.g. Wisd. v, 15; vi, 3.

<sup>6</sup> e.g. I Enoch, ix, 3; x, 1 (ed. Charles).



Other references in the earlier books of the O.T. are not well attested in the manuscripts and the Hebrew word is omitted in some readings.<sup>1</sup> Further references in the earlier books certainly read Ὑψίστος, but these passages are either additional LXX material<sup>2</sup> or are paraphrases of the original Hebrew (in which case יְהוָה does not appear).<sup>3</sup> Genesis xiv is therefore fairly untypical. A reference in Eusebius to a statement made by Philo of Byblus<sup>4</sup> that there was in Phoenician cult a god Elioun called Hypsistos is a reminder that the 'El 'Elyōn of Genesis xiv may refer to this Phoenician divinity. Nevertheless, it is noteworthy, according to H. Chadwick, that the epithet is not used as a proper name in invocations preserved in the magical papyri despite the LXX usage of Hypsistos,<sup>5</sup> although one might have expected this.

There are copious references in the Psalms to hypsistos, but even these are from those psalms which are post-exilic<sup>6</sup> and belong to the Persian and pre-Greek period.<sup>7</sup> Daniel has a considerable number of references. But by far the largest number occurs in Ecclesiastes. The result of this investigation is clear. While Hypsistos as an appellative of Yahweh does occur in the O.T., as a divine title without foreign influence, by far the largest number of references occurs in the Persian or pre-Greek period when Jewish theology was susceptible to alien influence. References are therefore extremely common in the inter-testamental period, for example in Tobit, I Enoch, the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Sibylline Oracles, II Baruch and IV Ezra.

It has been worthwhile studying at some length the usage of hypsistos. Although acceptable in Jewish circles, it was a word with

<sup>1</sup> e.g. Numb. xxiv, 16; Deut. xxxii, 8.

<sup>2</sup> e.g. (LXX) II Kings, xxii, 14.

<sup>3</sup> e.g. (LXX) Judg. xiii, 18.

<sup>4</sup> Philo of Byblus ap. Euseb. Praep. Ev. i, 10, 4.

<sup>5</sup> H. Chadwick, Early Christian Thought and the Classical Tradition, p.126.

<sup>6</sup> e.g. Psalms, xlv, xlvi, xlix, lvi, lxxii (LXX).

<sup>7</sup> e.g. Psalms, lxxvi, lxxvii, lxxxi, lxxxii, lxxxvi, xc, xci, xvi, cvi (LXX).

strong pagan connotations and redolent of the titles ascribed to the great gods of Asia Minor and the Aegean. It is a word avoided in the N.T. except on the few occasions stated. If God was too clearly hypsistos, he would be too much like Zeus Heliopolitanus or I.O.M. Dolichenus.

The Christian writers of the early period also avoided the word. It is used in I Clement<sup>1</sup> and once in Aristides.<sup>2</sup> There are two references in Theophilus.<sup>3</sup> Justin was therefore being quite scrupulous and conforming with those writers who believed in the monotheism of their doctrine of God and in the soleness of the Father. This was to be very important in Justin's cosmology. There was to be no compromise on Justin's part. His God was to be supreme, alone, unreachable and supra-mundane. All the epithets normally used of God in the C.T. could now be safely applied to the only person made evident in a theophany and that was the Logos.<sup>4</sup> All the anthropomorphisms of the O.T. were not of God revealing Himself to man, but of Logos, the Son of the Father. Justin in this way could prepare Trypho for the Hellenistic view of the Supreme God, the Unmoved Mover and the Intermediary in the person of the Logos.

<sup>1</sup> e.g. I Clem. 29, 2; 45, 7.

<sup>2</sup> Aristides, Apol. xv, 1: οὗτος δὲ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου ὁμολογεῖται ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ (ed. D.R. Bueno, Padres Apologistas Griegos).

<sup>3</sup> Theoph. ad. Autol. i, 4: ὑψίστος δὲ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν ἀνώτερον τῶν πάντων ii, 10: οὗτος οὖν, ὃν πνεῦμα θεοῦ καὶ ἀρχὴ καὶ σοφία καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου.

<sup>4</sup> e.g. Dial. c.



That this is more than speculation is demonstrated by the fact that there was a pseudo-Christian cult of the Hypsistarii or Hypsistiani with their object of worship the Most High God.<sup>1</sup> This cult was noticed in the 4th century A.D. and showed the influence of Christian, pagan and Jewish worship. These devotees worshipped a God whom they described as ὙΨΙΣΤΟΣ and ΠΑΥΤΟΚΡΑΤΩΡ. A remnant of Sabaeism, the cult was developed in the Mesopotamia area and it spread in Egypt, Palestine and Asia Minor (especially Cappadocia). The facts are well documented.<sup>2</sup> It is most unlikely that the origin of the title of the god of this cult lay in Judaism. The Oriental influence behind ὙΨΙΣΤΟΣ would appear to be above question and Justin was well advised to be very cautious in using the word.<sup>3</sup>

Yet for both Justin and Trypho, God transcended this world. As in the O.T., heaven - the supra-mundane places in the sky - was the dwelling place of God in the minds of most men. 'God of heaven' was known to Jews<sup>4</sup> and to others.<sup>5</sup> But to the Jew, the idea of God was meaningful in a strictly personal sense. 'He was supra-mundane, but not extra-mundane; exalted but not remote'.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Greg. Naz. Orat. xviii, 5; Greg. Nyss. con. Eunom. ii,5. Augustine calls the Hypsistiani caelicolae (Ep. 44, cap. vi, 13); caelicolae is used in the Codex Bezae to translate δεβόμενα (Acts, xiii,50; xvii,4); cf. Juv. Sat. xiv,97: nil praeter nubes et coeli numen adorant.

<sup>2</sup> D.C.B. s.v. Hypsistarii.

<sup>3</sup> But see H. Chadwick, op. cit. p.126: 'the occurrence of the epithet in Jewish inscriptions at Delos and the Crimea is not in itself evidence of syncretism, though no doubt the Jews in these places were very liberal in their assimilation to the Greeks around them ... opinion being divided whether the worshippers were hellenizing Jews or judaizing Gentiles'. This is a weighty opinion. But the evidence for syncretism in hypsistos does not spring only from Delos and the Crimea.

<sup>4</sup> e.g. Ezra, v,11,12; Neh. i,4,5; ii,4; Dan. ii,18.

<sup>5</sup> Ezra, i,2; vi,9,10.

<sup>6</sup> G.F. Moore, Judaism, I,423.

If speculation imagined the Creator and Lord of the world enthroned above the skies, encompassed about by a throng of worshipping angels, this did not obstruct the Jews from believing that He was near when they prayed to Him. Countless legends based on the visions of Ezekiel described God's celestial abode.<sup>1</sup> But we find in a Jewish daily prayer, recited even today, "Thou art the Lord our God in heaven and on earth and in the highest heavens of heavens". Justin too rejected the cosmic God of the Stoics that God μηδὲν εἶναι παρὰ τρεπόμενα καὶ ἀλλοιούμενα καὶ ἀναλυόμενα εἰς τὰ αὐτὰ αἰεὶ.<sup>2</sup> But he was quite firm in rejecting the Jewish view of the nearness of God on earth.

No-one was nearer to the Jew than the God of heaven. "But let a man go into the synagogue and take his place behind the pulpit and pray in an undertone, and God will give ear to his prayer, as it is said: 'Hannah was speaking within herself, only her lips moved, but her voice was not audible'<sup>3</sup> and God gave ear to her prayer; and so He does to all His creatures, as it is said, 'A prayer of the afflicted when he covers his face and pours out his thought before the Lord.'<sup>4</sup> It is as when a man utters his thought in the ear of his fellow, and he hears him. Can you have a God nearer than this who is as near to His creatures as mouth to ear?"<sup>5</sup> Though this rabbinical extract is admittedly any period up to but not later than the 4th century A.D., yet the sentiments belong to any period. The main service on the Day of Atonement in Jewish synagogues is introduced by

<sup>1</sup> e.g. Psalm, lxxviii, 4; cf. Chagigah, 12b, 13a.

<sup>2</sup> II Apol. vi (vii), 9.

<sup>3</sup> I Sam. i, 13.

<sup>4</sup> Psalm, cii (title).

<sup>5</sup> Jer. Berakot, 13a.



Isaiah lvii,15: 'For thus saith the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy: I dwell in the high and holy place, with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit.' But Justin is adamant that Trypho should not interpret the location of God as being near in a spatial sense. This would put him unequivocally into a position of accepting Stoic teaching if he were to do this: "wherever God says 'God went up from Abraham'<sup>1</sup> or 'the Lord spake to Moses'<sup>2</sup> and 'the Lord came down to behold the tower which the sons of men had built'<sup>3</sup> or when 'God shut Noah into the Ark',<sup>4</sup> you must not imagine that the unbegotten God Himself came down or went up from any place." For Justin goes on to say: ὁ γὰρ ἀρρητος πατήρ καὶ κύριος τῶν πάντων οὔτε ποὶ ἀφίκεται οὔτε περιπατεῖ οὔτε καθεύδει οὔτε ἀνίσταται ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ χώρᾳ, ὅπου ποτε, μένει ... οὔτε κινούμενος ὁ τόπῳ τε ἀχώρητος καὶ τῷ κόσμῳ ὅλῳ, ὅς γε ἦν καὶ πρὶν τὸν κόσμον γενέσθαι.<sup>5</sup> Justin also claims that He who appeared to Abraham under the oak of Mamre is God sent to judge Sodom by another: ὑπ' ἄλλου, τοῦ ἐν τοῖς ὑπερουρανίοις αἰεὶ μένοντος καὶ οὐδενὶ ὀφθέντος ἢ ὁμιλήσαντος δι' ἑαυτοῦ ποτε ὃν ποιητὴν τῶν ὅλων καὶ πατέρα γοοῦμεν.<sup>6</sup> This is a clear statement of God's transcendence and creates all kinds of difficulties for Justin as we shall see below.

This transcendent God for Justin is the most true God and Christians do not disbelieve in τοῦ ἀληθεστάτου καὶ πατρὸς δικαιοδύνης καὶ βωφροδύνης καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀρετῶν, ἀνεπιμήκτου τε κακίας θεοῦ.<sup>7</sup> The word ἀληθής used of God here is far from a common description of God. The various

<sup>1</sup> Gen. xvii,22.

<sup>2</sup> Exod. vi,29.

<sup>3</sup> Gen. xi,5.

<sup>4</sup> Gen. vii,16.

<sup>5</sup> Dial. cxxvii,1,2.

<sup>6</sup> ibid. lvi,1.

<sup>7</sup> I Apol. vi,1.

writers prefer ἀληθινός. For example, ἀληθινός is descriptive in John 1,9 of the true light and is used in the sense of being 'genuine' as opposed to 'shadowy', 'imperfect' or 'unsubstantial' whereas ἀληθής would be 'true' as opposed to 'false'.<sup>1</sup> But ἀληθής is not frequently used of God in the LXX. It is not a word found in the N.T. as a description of God and it is not very common in the century after the N.T. A long search in the relevant papyri produced no example of its being applied to God. The true nature of God is invariably ἀληθινός whether used in John, vii,28: 'He that sent me is ἀληθινός' or in I Clement, xliii,6 where Moses acted to glorify the name τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ καὶ μόνου Θεοῦ. We are obliged to ask why Justin preferred the use of ἀληθής (when ἀληθινός might have approximated more to a Platonic view of the nature of God). We can only conclude that the reason was stylistic. If a theological explanation has to be given, we might possibly find for a view that Justin found his concept of God intellectually true as far as intelligent argument carried him. Justin however used a different expression for the same idea: 'Jesus Christ... the Son of the true God Himself (τοῦ ὄντως Θεοῦ)'.<sup>2</sup>

God's other attributes are touched upon by Justin. God is the Father of righteousness and other virtues.<sup>3</sup> Christians dedicate themselves to the good God (τῷ ἀγαθῷ ... Θεῷ).<sup>4</sup> St. Mark is quoted where Jesus says: 'There is none good, but God only.'<sup>5</sup>

That God knows everything which is occurring in His world is a common theme in the Biblical literature. He sees everything under the whole heaven.<sup>6</sup> Justin believes that God knows the actions and thoughts of all His creatures<sup>7</sup> and it is impossible for the wicked to escape His notice.<sup>8</sup> God has a concern for the race of men and this is the reason

<sup>1</sup> J.H. Bernard, I.C.C. John, I, p.11; C.K. Barrett, The Gospel according to St. John, p.134.

<sup>2</sup> I Apol. xiii,3: τοῦ ὄντως Θεοῦ.

<sup>3</sup> I Apol. vi,1.

<sup>4</sup> ibid. xiv,2.

<sup>5</sup> ibid. xvi,7; Mark, x,18.

<sup>6</sup> Job, xxviii,24.

<sup>7</sup> I Apol. xii,1.

<sup>8</sup> ibid. xii,3.



why He has delayed punishing those who follow the Devil.<sup>1</sup> Justin quotes the O.T. prophets to show what moral teachings come from God.<sup>2</sup> This moral law which He himself has given, demands obedience since the Father teaches us to do the same things as Himself.<sup>3</sup>

God is the witness of our thoughts and deeds.<sup>4</sup> He is the just observer of all: θεὸν τῶν πάντων ἐπόπτην δίκαιον οἶδαμεν.<sup>5</sup> The epithet ἐπόπτης used of Justin's God needs a comment since it had important connotations in the pagan world. In the N.T. it is a hapax legomenon in II Pet. i,16 where it is used of the faithful who were eye-witnesses (ἐπόπται) of the majesty of the Lord Jesus Christ. The word used of God appears only in the Apocrypha or the later Greek versions of the O.T., but not in the LXX version of the Hebrew canonical books.<sup>6</sup> The word has no Hebrew equivalent. These passages were susceptible to Persian influence. Another instance occurs in the insertion into the LXX text made by unknown hands to amplify the Hebrew text, perhaps originating in Egypt in the early 1st century B.C.<sup>7</sup> The word is also used as an epithet of God in the Letter of Aristeas, 16: [the Jews] τὸν γὰρ πάντων ἐπόπτην καὶ κτίστην θεὸν οὗτοι δέβονται. It is used only by Clement of Rome among the Apostolic Fathers<sup>8</sup> and not at all in the Apologists except in this single passage of Justin's.

<sup>1</sup> I Apol. xxviii,1-2. God also delays the destruction of the world : διὰ τὸ ὁπέρμα τῶν Χριστιανῶν (II Apol. vi(vii),1).

<sup>2</sup> e.g. I Apol. xxxvii,8.

<sup>3</sup> e.g. II Apol. ix,2.

<sup>4</sup> II Apol. xii,4; cf. Rom.i,9; Phil.i,8; I Thess.i,5; ii,10.

<sup>5</sup> II Apol. xii,6.

<sup>6</sup> II Macc.iii,39: αὐτὸς γὰρ . . . ἐπόπτης ἐστὶ ; vii,35: τὴν τοῦ παντοκράτορος ἐπόπτου θεοῦ κρίσιν ; III Macc. ii,21: ὁ πάντων ἐπόπτης θεός ; cf. II Macc. ix,5: ὁ δὲ παντεπόπτης κύριος ὁ θεός.

<sup>7</sup> Esther , v,1: ἐπικαλεσάμενη τὸν πάντων ἐπόπτην θεόν.

The first three verses in this chapter differ widely in the Greek and Hebrew texts. For the differences in the two Greek recensions and the question of the Hebrew or Aramaic original, see S. Jellicoe, The Septuagint and Modern Study, pp.294-295.

<sup>8</sup> I Clem. iv,6; lix,3: τὸν ἐπόπτην ἀνθρωπίνων ἔργων ; cf. lxiv,1: ὁ πανεπόπτης θεός.

The word was a cult title applied to Zeus.<sup>1</sup> It was applied to Poseidon<sup>2</sup> and to the Sun.<sup>3</sup> It is not surprising that it was used as an eulogistic title of Pompey in an inscription from Cyzicus<sup>4</sup> and Augustus is similarly described.<sup>5</sup> The term was taken over and applied to those initiates being admitted to the highest grade of the Eleusinian mysteries.<sup>6</sup> Justin was aware of the cults of the mysteries and refers to them specifically.<sup>7</sup> He could hardly be unaware of the significance of epoptes as a technical term. But if the term was familiar to Justin as a cult epithet for initiates into one of the mystery religions, this cannot be the sense in which he uses it of God. He is in something of a dilemma. He fully believes that God sees all things (πάντ' ἐφορᾷ), but He does not have eyes.<sup>8</sup> God does not see as we see since this would be too anthropomorphic for Justin.

The verb ἐφορᾷ has a sense of inspecting, of having oversight of, of observation with interest. This is the sense of the Hebrew equivalent of נָחַם where this is translated by ἐφορᾷ in the canonical books of the O.T.<sup>9</sup> Justin is unwilling or unable to ascribe to God the sense of seeing since this would give him too much distinction as a physical reality in a physical world. Throughout the

<sup>1</sup> A.B. Cook, Zeus, I, 737 (with refs.).

<sup>2</sup> Paus. viii, 30, 1.

<sup>3</sup> Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae, ed. W. Dittenberger, 666, 25 (Egypt, 1st cent. A.D.); Sammelbuch Griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten, 1323 (2nd cent. A.D.).

<sup>4</sup> JHS, xxvii, p. 64: ἐπόπτης γῆς τε καὶ θαλάσσης.

<sup>5</sup> Inscriptiones Graecae ad res Romanas pertinentes, ed. R. Cagnat, iv, 309, 2 (B.C. 29): Θεοῦ υἱὸν Θεὸν Σεβαστό[ν πάσης] γῆ[ς καὶ θ[α]λάσσης [ἐ]π[όπ]τ[ήν] ; cf. ibid. i, 255, 777 from Selymbria; i, 17.

<sup>6</sup> Recueil d'inscriptions grecques. Ed. C. Michel, 1141; Sylloge inscriptionum Graecarum, ed. W. Dittenberger, 657, 4; 658, 3.

Inscriptiones Graecae, Vol. I, ed. minor 6, 51 ed. F. Hiller. Plut. Alc. 22.

See L.R. Farnell, Cults of the Greek States, iii, 126 ff.

<sup>7</sup> e.g. I Apol. xxvii, 4.

<sup>8</sup> Dial. cxxvii, 2.

<sup>9</sup> e.g. Job, xxi, 12; Psalms, xxxiv (xxxv), 17; Zach. ix, 1.



Dialogue he is at great pains to explain away every trace of anthropomorphic traits and any hint of a theophany of God and to credit these to the Son. Justin affords many titles to God as we have seen above; none of these brings God into a warm personal relationship with himself.

Justin does not understand (or if he does, he is silent about it) a relationship which is an absorption in God's very self as revealed in His Son; he does not comment that it is possible to progress into a more intimate knowledge of God's saving purposes, made plain both in the march of historical events and in direct revelation. Justin shows little understanding of the nature of sin except in specific singular terms and he has no concept of the boundless nature of God's grace.

Even the God who is witness of our thoughts and deeds is ἀγένητος καὶ ἀρρητος.<sup>1</sup> This ἀγένητος God is good (ἀγαθός),<sup>2</sup> but these are titles of God rather than marks of a special insight into God's fundamental nature. It is hard to accept the view of L.W. Barnard that 'Justin is drawing on the biblical and Christian conception of God as a living Creator, a compassionate and long-suffering Father who in Christ has drawn near to His creation and who is concerned with the welfare of every individual soul'.<sup>3</sup> Justin does not make the concept of 'living Creator' a meaningful one. It is true that God is δημιουργός, ποιητής and κτίστης.<sup>4</sup> But these terms were even more familiar to the pagan philosophers as will be shown below.<sup>5</sup> Even if Justin employs these concepts to describe God, we are still nevertheless a long way from interpreting them in Barnard's sense. Even if God is most true, as Barnard says he is<sup>6</sup> in referring to Justin's

<sup>1</sup> II Apol. xi1,4.

<sup>2</sup> I Apol. xiv,2.

<sup>3</sup> L.W. Barnard, Justin Martyr: His Life and Thought, p.78.

<sup>4</sup> For these terms, see p.63.

<sup>5</sup> See pp.64-65.

<sup>6</sup> op. cit. p.78.

belief that Jesus Christ teaches us about God, that Jesus Christ, born for this purpose, crucified under Pontius Pilate, the Son of the true God Himself,<sup>1</sup> (τοῦ ὄντως Θεοῦ) Barnard cannot derive his insight from this link between Christ and the true God since Justin follows this credal statement with a description of God as τὸν ἀτρέπτον καὶ ἀεὶ ὄντα Θεόν.<sup>2</sup> This is a full-blooded description of the Supreme Principle taken straight from the philosophical schools. Nothing could be further from Barnard's claim that Justin was drawing on a biblical and Christian conception of God as living Creator, a compassionate and long-suffering Father. If Barnard is describing the being of Justin's God as ἀτρέπτος, this is not a concept he finds in the LXX since the word appears only once, and then in the revision of Symmachus under Job, xv,15. If God alone is real,<sup>3</sup> Plutarch will certainly provide evidence for this too.<sup>4</sup> Plutarch also ascribes compassion to his supreme God: ἀλλὰ καὶ φιλόανθρωπον καὶ κηδεμονικὸν καὶ ὠφέλιμον προλαμβάνεσθαι καὶ νοεῖσθαι τὸν Θεόν<sup>5</sup> and this God is long-suffering too since He cares for the souls of sinners and gives them time to repent.<sup>6</sup>

Barnard says that Justin is drawing on the biblical conception of God who is concerned with the welfare of every individual soul.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> I Apol. xiii,3.

<sup>2</sup> ibid.

<sup>3</sup> L.W. Barnard, ibid. See I Apol. xiii,3; cf. John, xvii,3: ὁ μόνος ἀλήθινος Θεός.

<sup>4</sup> Plut. De E apud Delphos, 392, E - F; 393, A - B; cf. Philo, Quod det. pot. 44,160.

<sup>5</sup> Plut. De comm. not. 32, p.1075.

<sup>6</sup> id. De sera numinis vindicta, 5 (550 C - F); 6 (551 C - E).

<sup>7</sup> See above.



There is nothing uniquely biblical about this. Maximus of Tyre is equally explicit when he says that God παρέχοντα τοῖς πειθομένοις δωτηρίαν ὑπάρχουσαν ἐν αὐτῷ.<sup>1</sup> Albinus believes that his Supreme Principle ἀγαθὸν μὲν ἔστι, διότι πάντα εἰς δύναμιν εὐεργεῖται, παντὸς ἀγαθοῦ αἴτιος ὢν.<sup>2</sup> Similarly Porphyry in the 3rd cent. A.D. draws the various strands of beliefs of his predecessors together and writes: τέσσαρα στοιχεῖα μάλιστα κεκρατύνθω περὶ θεοῦ· πίστις, ἀλήθεια, ἔρως, ἐλπίς. πιστεύειν γὰρ δεῖ ὅτι μόνῃ δωτηρία ἡ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἐπιδτεροφῇ.<sup>3</sup> Here we might be reading St. Paul. But this is a higher concept of God than we read in the work of Justin. L.W. Barnard continues to summarize the attributes of Justin's God in his attempt to prove Justin was drawing on the biblical and Christian conception of God. Justin's God alone has life in Himself: 'The soul partakes of life (ζωῆς δὲ ψυχῇ μετέχει ) since God wills it to live . . . for to live is not its attributes (ἰδιον ) as it is God's'.<sup>4</sup> But Justin has said a moment earlier: 'The soul lives, not as being life, but as sharing in life (μεταλαμβάνουσα τῆς ζωῆς).<sup>5</sup> Here appears a series of technical terms drawn from Middle Platonism.

The entire argument is non-Jewish and non-Christian in the N.T. sense. It is the certain witness of the N.T. writers that God bestows upon believers victory over spiritual death and physical death. This victory in the form of eternal life is given not after death, but in the present.<sup>6</sup> It is eternal life because it is a life in fellowship with God.<sup>7</sup> Plato's view of the immortality of the ψυχῇ (which Justin is

<sup>1</sup>Max. Tyr. Philosoph, xi,12e. (ed. Hobein).

<sup>2</sup>Albinus, Didask. x,3. (ed. Hermann).

<sup>3</sup>Porphyry. ad. Marc. 24 (ed. Nauck).

<sup>4</sup>Dial. vi,1 - 2.

<sup>5</sup>ibid.

<sup>6</sup>John, v,24; I John, v,12.

<sup>7</sup>I John, i,2.

postulating) was that it was to be a life of close, harmonious communion with the ultimate Good. In Plato's belief, the body was a tomb<sup>1</sup> and the ψυχή was released from the body at death. He drew a distinction between the temporal tomb of the body and the immortal ψυχή. Plato and his successors taught the soul would receive a share of true life ( μετέχω | μεταλαμβάνω ) after death, sharing that life with the ultimate Good. When Christ became incarnate, he became according to Justin τὸ λογικὸν τὸ ὅλον ... καὶ σῶμα καὶ λόγον καὶ ψυχὴν .<sup>2</sup> This tripartite division of Christ's nature is reflected in the tripartite nature of man as being body, spirit and soul: 'so too whenever it is necessary for the existence of the soul to come to an end, the φωτικὸν πνεῦμα leaves it and the soul no longer has an existence, but it goes again to that place from where it was received.'<sup>3</sup>

Plato described the three parts of the soul as νοῦς, θυμός and ἐπιθυμία. Only the highest part of the soul which is the reasonable (λογιστικόν) part, is immortal. The νοῦς in Aristotle had its origin apart from the body and because it was divine, did not die when the body died.<sup>4</sup> Plutarch refers to a first death which separates soul and body and to a second death which separates νοῦς from the lower parts of the soul.<sup>5</sup> Albinus knows of the three parts of the ψυχή: ὅτι δὲ τριμερὴς ἔστιν ἡ ψυχή κατὰ τὰς δυνάμεις<sup>6</sup> and following Plato, he claims, a part is immortal.<sup>7</sup> The man who loves

<sup>1</sup> Plato, Gorg. 493A: καὶ τὸ μὲν σῶμα ἔστιν ἡμῶν σῆμα; cf. Crat. 400 B.

<sup>2</sup> II Apol. x, 1.

<sup>3</sup> Dial. vi, 1-2; cf. Pseudo-Justin, de Resurrectione, 8-10. (ed. Migne, VI, 1584 ff.).

<sup>4</sup> Arist. De gen. et corr. II, 2, p. 736b 27f: λείπεται δὲ τὸν νοῦν μόνον θύραθεν ἐπειδίδεναι καὶ θεῖον εἶναι μόνον.

<sup>5</sup> Plutarch, De facie in orbe lunae, 943 B.

<sup>6</sup> Albinus, Didask. xxiv (ed. Hermann).

<sup>7</sup> id. xxv: τὸ δὲ τοιοῦτον ἀθάνατον.



God, in the opinion of Maximus of Tyre, awaits his call and knows that when the divine summons comes at death, then he will behold God himself.<sup>1</sup> In the Phaedrus of Plato, the soul which leaves the body does so for a period of ten thousand years and is not able to return εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ ὄθεν ἦκε, unless it passes through incarnations.<sup>2</sup>

The reward for the Christian who has shown obedience to God, is seen by Justin not as a reward for the entire man by whom 'came also the resurrection of the dead; for as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all men be made alive,'<sup>3</sup> but as a kind of immortality for the soul and only for that part which is intellectual and divine. Like the Orphics, he believed that a part of the soul was 'an exile from God and a wanderer' and that after death it returned to that place from where it was received.<sup>4</sup> This is a belief of the Middle Platonists. For example, 'if then the soul will exist after death, and was existing before it fell in with the body',<sup>5</sup> Albinus makes of this that the soul is eternal and brings life to whatsoever it is attached.<sup>6</sup> Together with these Platonist ideas on the destiny of the soul after death, Justin has no doubts about the Resurrection of the body. This he sees as quite fundamental to Christian belief. The proofs of this are discussed in detail in the Apologies and in the Dialogue.<sup>7</sup> His language is rather uncritical, but he appears to believe in the resurrection of the natural body.<sup>8</sup> In addition he believes that a new Jerusalem will be built and that the faithful will live there for a thousand years.<sup>9</sup> He

<sup>1</sup>Max. Tyr. Philosoph. 17, 11 (ed. Hobein).

<sup>2</sup>Plat. Phaedr. 248 E seq.

<sup>3</sup>I Cor. xv, 22.

<sup>4</sup>Dial. vi, 2; see above.

<sup>5</sup>Albinus, Didask. xxv (ed. Hermann).

<sup>6</sup>ibid.

<sup>7</sup>e.g. I Apol. xviii - xix; Dial. lxxx, 5: καὶ ἄρκος ἀνάβηται γυνήδεσθαι ἐπιετάρμεθα.

<sup>8</sup>I Apol. viii, 5; xviii, 6; xix, 4; lxi, 3.

<sup>9</sup>Dial. lxxx, 5.

bases this belief on biblical evidences<sup>1</sup> (although he does qualify this belief). Justin demonstrates in these passages a chiliastic outlook in company with other Fathers<sup>2</sup>.

In contrast to these Platonist views of Justin concerning the immortality and resurrection of man, the Jews of the O.T. on the other hand held fast to the view that the body and the soul formed a unity, the resurrection therefore being a resurrection of the whole body-soul man. In Daniel, there seems to be a resurrection of the physical body from the dust.<sup>3</sup> It is equally clear that parts of Psalms xlix and lxxiii and Job, xxxiv 14, Ecclesiastes xii,7 and other places show a belief in the soul's redemption by God. These passages are not very dissimilar from the Greek philosophical speculations outlined above. In the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the O.T. both ideas are evident.<sup>4</sup> The resurrection of the physical body is the theme of II Enoch, lxv,6 and II Baruch 1 - 11. In I Enoch we have several versions of the Jewish beliefs. God will establish a Messianic kingdom of eternal duration for the soul and body.<sup>5</sup> A spiritual kingdom is also imagined where the righteous have a spiritual body.<sup>6</sup> We are reminded of Justin's view that a new Jerusalem would be founded and that this would be the home of the faithful for a thousand years. We find further in I Enoch the belief that only the spirit would enjoy the resurrection.<sup>7</sup> But the basic doctrine of Judaism was the resurrection of the soul-body, the revivification of those who had died.

<sup>1</sup> Isaiah, lrv,17-25; Psalms, xo; Rev. xxi.

<sup>2</sup> e.g. Iren. adv. Haer. v,xxxi (ed. Harvey); Orig. Principia, II, xi (ed. Koetschau); Euseb. H.E. III,28; VII,25 (Loeb).

<sup>3</sup> Dan. xii,2: ἐν γῆς χύματα ἐξέγερθῆναι.

<sup>4</sup> e.g. II Macc. xii,43-44; cf. ibid. vii, where the story of the seven martyrs clearly demonstrates a belief in a physical resurrection.

<sup>5</sup> I Enoch, vi-xxxvi; lxxxiii-xo (ed. Charles).

<sup>6</sup> ibid. xxxvii-lxxi.

<sup>7</sup> ibid. xci-civ.



The N.T. writers accepted this view and transformed it. In the life beyond the tomb, the faithful departed will have not only their souls, but a spiritual and new body. Plato maintained that the soul is immortal; the N.T. writers in contrast believed that the soul could perish, but that the whole man is redeemable, not simply his ψυχή. Justin prefers Plato to Paul.

When L.W. Barnard considered that Justin's view of God was no other than the biblical and Christian conception of God, he adduced as evidence that Justin's God was good.<sup>1</sup> The concept of Divine Goodness is an important one in the speculation of the Platonists of the early Empire. Albinus insists on it. While he is certain that the Supreme Being has no form and no differentiation and that no evil or good can happen to him, yet: κατὰ μετεχὴν γὰρ τινος ἔσται οὗτος καὶ μάλιστα ἀγαθότητος.<sup>2</sup> He further states that God ἀγαθὸν μὲν ἔστι, διότι πάντα εἰς δύναμιν ἐργετῇ, πάντος ἀγαθοῦ αἴτιος ὢν.<sup>3</sup> Maximus of Tyre assumed that God was responsible for Good when he asked his pertinent question in consequence of his assumption: τοῦ θεοῦ τὰ ἀγαθὰ ποιῶντος πόθεν τὰ κακὰ.<sup>4</sup> Celsus maintained that evil did not come from (by implication) a good God.<sup>5</sup> The Neoplatonists took a similar view of God's goodness.<sup>6</sup> Only a supreme love could lead Maximus of Tyre to say: 'the man who loves God awaits his call and knows that when the divine summons comes at death, then he will behold God himself.'<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> op. cit. p.78.

<sup>2</sup> Albinus, Didask. x,4 (ed. Hermann).

<sup>3</sup> ibid. x,3.

<sup>4</sup> Max. Tyr. Philosoph. 41 (ed. Hobein).

<sup>5</sup> Origen, Cels. iv,65 (ed. Koetschau).

<sup>6</sup> e.g. Plotin. Enn. iv,4,39.

<sup>7</sup> Max. Tyr. Philosoph. 17,11 (ed. Hobein).

We further note that the virtues of God are described by Justin in words not used in the N.T; e.g. ἐλεήμων ὁ θεὸς καὶ φιланθρωπός ἐστιν.<sup>1</sup> We find ἐλεήμων used only twice in the N.T., once of people,<sup>2</sup> and once of Jesus Christ, the High Priest.<sup>3</sup> φιλάνθρωπος is not found in the N.T. at all.<sup>4</sup> Furthermore, Justin says, 'we pray that even now all of you may repent and obtain mercy παρὰ τοῦ εὐεπλάγχνου καὶ πολυελέου πατρὸς τῶν ὁλῶν θεοῦ'.<sup>5</sup> Neither εὐεπλάγχνος nor πολυέλεος is found in the N.T. The expression 'father δικαιοσύνης καὶ σωφροσύνης'<sup>6</sup> is not known to N.T. writers; the virtue of σωφροσύνη is never used of God in the N.T.<sup>7</sup>

We find too that Justin takes a harsh view of God as a judge. None of our acts can escape the judgement of God and if all men knew this they would be virtuous. Each man goes to everlasting punishment or salvation according to the value of his actions. For if all men knew this, they would restrain themselves, adorn themselves with virtue and obtain thereby the good gifts of God.<sup>8</sup> Barnard amplifies this view of Justin by quoting further references. God knows both actions and thoughts of all his creatures.<sup>9</sup> He foreknows everything, not because he has decreed that men shall act as they do or be what they are, but because in foreseeing all events God ordains reward or punishment accordingly.<sup>10</sup> He requires obedience and he enforces the moral law.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Dial. cvii,2.

<sup>2</sup> Matt. v,7.

<sup>3</sup> Heb. ii,17.

<sup>4</sup> cf. Dial. cvii,2; φιλάνθρωπος as a substantive is used once of people, Acts, xxviii,2, once of God, Tit. iii,4.

<sup>5</sup> cf. Dial. cviii,3.

<sup>6</sup> I Apol. vi,1.

<sup>7</sup> cf. Acts, xxvi,25; I Tim. ii,9.

<sup>8</sup> I Apol. xii, passim.

<sup>9</sup> ibid.; II Apol. xii. See above p. 12.

<sup>10</sup> I Apol. xii; xliii; xliv; II Apol. vi (vii).

<sup>11</sup> II Apol. vi (vii); ix.



Timaeus of Locri (about whom little is known except what one can glean from Plato's Timaeus where he is a principal interlocutor) was later considered to be leader of the Pythagoreans of his day. He claimed that men who live their lives in obedience to  $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$  live lives of happiness; but disobedience has as a consequence punishment in the life hereafter and reincarnation.<sup>1</sup> Plutarch also says that God in spite of God's long-suffering nature and although He gives men adequate time to change their ways  $\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\nu \delta' \epsilon\pi\iota\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega\varsigma\iota$   $\kappa\alpha\iota \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma \alpha\pi\epsilon\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon \tau\eta\nu \delta\iota\kappa\eta\nu$ .<sup>2</sup>

I can see little distinction between Justin's view of God's judgement and salvation based on a system of reward and punishment system of retribution and that of higher paganism. The difference was certainly not between a Christian rigorism in ethics (as advocated by Justin) and pagan looseness. According to E.R. Dodds, the Christian and Neoplatonist ethics of this period are not easily distinguishable.<sup>3</sup> Justin has not been the only thinker who in accepting the power of free-will in men, yet wants to reconcile this with God's foreknowledge.<sup>4</sup> The function of Jesus Christ is to convert men's wills and to strengthen men's free choice of what is good.<sup>5</sup> It is in this way that men are saved ( $\epsilon\kappa \mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\nu\omicron\iota\alpha\varsigma$ ).<sup>6</sup> God takes pleasure in those who imitate his properties and is displeased with those who embrace what is worthless either in word or deed.<sup>7</sup> It is by our works according to Justin and because we keep God's commandments that we are saved.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Tim. Locr. de anima mundi, 12 (ed. Hermann, post Platonis Timaeum, Leipzig, 1852).

<sup>2</sup>Plut. de sera numinis vindicta, 6 (551 E).

<sup>3</sup>E.R. Dodds, Pagan and Christian in an Age of Anxiety, 119 ff.

<sup>4</sup>e.g. I Apol. x,4; xxviii,3; xliii; xliv,11; II Apol. vi (vii),3. For 'free will' and God's 'foreknowledge', see I Apol. xliii.

<sup>5</sup>I Apol. lxi,10.

<sup>6</sup>I Apol. xxviii,2.

<sup>7</sup>II Apol. iiii (iv),2.

<sup>8</sup>I Apol. lxv,1.

If one discounts for the present the redemptive work of the Son-Logos in Justin and studies God's role in the act of redemption, there is little to support Barnard's viewpoint about the biblical and Christian conception of God in Justin's writings. One must also take issue with E.R. Goodenough who claims that Justin in several passages indicates that he perfectly understood and fully accepted the doctrine of God's loving and even sorrowing solicitude for individuals as for humanity.<sup>1</sup> Goodenough presents as evidence three passages. None of them supports such a view of 'loving and even sorrowing solicitude'. In the first passage,<sup>2</sup> God leads the race of men to recollection, showing that he cares for it (i.e. the race). This is quite impersonal and is far from sorrowing solicitude for individuals. Again, men have been born rational and able to contemplate. εἰ δ' ἐ τις ἀπιστεῖ μέλειν τούτων τῷ θεῷ he will thereby confess that God does not exist.<sup>3</sup> τούτων is either neuter in the sense that God cares for these things (i.e. capacities) or if τούτων means these men who are rational, this is surely a weak and inadequate construction on which Goodenough substantiates such a claim. There is a reference to God's care for the individual, made in an unequivocal way.<sup>4</sup> But even here it is not in the sense of a deep, caring solicitude of utter love. Goodenough has not succeeded in proving his point.

We look in vain in Justin for the N.T.'s view of God's share in Christian redemption. For example, the N.T. tells us that God sent His Son 'to buy out those who were in subjection to the law that we might receive the adoption of sons'.<sup>5</sup> It was not merely a release from the

<sup>1</sup>E.R. Goodenough, The Theology of Justin Martyr, p.136.

<sup>2</sup>I Apol. xlv,11.

<sup>3</sup>ibid. xxviii,4.

<sup>4</sup>Dial. i,4.

<sup>5</sup>Gal. iv,5; cf. i,4.



Mosaic law which God arranged, 'for as many as are led by the Spirit of God, these are sons of God. The Spirit himself beareth witness ... that we are the children of God; and, if children, then heirs; heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ.'<sup>1</sup> The crucifixion of Jesus was God's act of redemption. M. von Engelhardt claimed that Justin did not conceive of God as Love and that Justin never made the transition from a belief in a Platonist Absolute to a Personal God.<sup>2</sup> Although this is an extreme view, yet it is hard to substantiate a view that Justin knew of the God who sent His only-beloved Son into the world or of the God who was a Person, active in intimate relationship both with His Son and with us, His adopted sons. Christians, for Justin, needed only a knowledge of God and His requirements; Christians needed only to imitate God in their ways on earth. This 'has sense and value only when God is not a personality, love and grace, but is the creating Prime-Intelligence which man has to recognize, and is the "world-Law which man must fulfil."<sup>3</sup> The text of Justin in the mind of the present writer supports such an opinion.

Justin has emphasized the majestic and the sovereign aspects of God's nature. He believes in the just and jealous God of the O.T. God is just because He has constituted the law and one obeys the precepts or not as one feels free to choose. But dependent on the choice are the consequences of damnation or bliss. God is jealous too. It is this aspect of God which prevailed against all the odds. Even when the Jewish nation faced despair in exile and theological compromise seemed inevitable, the jealousy of God in the end proved a more powerful instrument for ultimate triumph than the temptations of easy syncretism.

<sup>1</sup> Rom. viii, 14-17 (R.V.).

<sup>2</sup> M. von Engelhardt, Das Christentum Justins des Märtyrers Erlangen, passim, esp. 231-241, 447 ff.

<sup>3</sup> ibid. pp. 482-483.

Justin's God, where He is not the cosmic being of the Middle Platonists, is not unlike Jupiter Dolichenus or Jupiter Heliopolitanus or any other of the Anatolian Gods described as hypsistos at those points where He is not linked to the Son-Logos. We are reminded of passages in the de Mundo: e.g. νόμος γὰρ ἡμῖν ἰσοκλήνης ὁ θεός, οὐδεμίαν ἐπισχεόμενος διορθῶειν ἢ μετὰ θεῶν.<sup>1</sup> Justin has a view of God not unlike that of the anonymous author of the de Mundo who compares the supreme God with the majesty and magnificence of the great king of Persia.<sup>2</sup> This entire passage repays detailed study.

Up to this point, we have been studying those aspects of God's nature which superficially would appear to be Jewish and seem to be depicting God as He is in the O.T. This is one of the fixed terms of the equation of the relationship of the Father and the Son in Justin. Our author illustrates each mention of God with long illustrations from the LXX. We have been at pains to quote modern authors who have seen in Justin's concept of God a true and biblically accurate description of the God of the Bible and of Christian belief. Yet we have demonstrated that although there are comparisons and similarities, Justin does not inspire us with a deep knowledge or reverence for a personal God. There is no evidence of the warmth in a filial relationship and no response answers us from a caring Father. In short, Justin seems to have little acquaintance with the fact that we are all sons by adoption. When we turn to the many passages where Justin is obviously drawing on his Platonist understanding of God as a cosmic figure, we are left in no doubt about God's utter transcendence.

<sup>1</sup> Pseudo-Aristotle, de Mundo, 400b (ed. Loeb). This work, once accredited to Aristotle, is now universally thought to be the work of an anonymous author, almost certainly of the 1st. century A.D.

<sup>2</sup> ibid. 397 b.



Justin uses the term Father and applies it to God with a remarkable frequency. This is so familiar an appellative of God in the O.T. and N.T. that to the unwary, Justin is simply accepting the biblical image of God. But almost invariably Justin links God the Father with a phrase which connects His fatherhood with creation. God is the Father and Maker of all e.g. τῆς μετὰ θεοῦ τοῦ πάντων πατρὸς καὶ δημιουργοῦ διαγωγῆς ἀντιποιούμεθα.<sup>1</sup> The Father of all is linked here with δημιουργός which is a Platonist term referring to the fabricator ἐξ ὄντων as opposed to the non-Platonist idea of the Creator ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων. The only occasion when δημιουργός is used in the LXX is in II Maccabees iv, 1 referring not to God, but to a human being.<sup>2</sup> The Father is also connected by Justin with the διαγωγή or διαγωγή τοῦ βίου, again a Platonist term (= ratio vitae). The creator of the world is the Maker and Father of all. These are strictly non-Biblical terms.

In the O.T. God the Father rules and cares for His children: 'The Lord thy God bare thee, as a man doth bear his son, in all the way that ye went.'<sup>3</sup> The Fatherhood of God implied a personal relationship with men who obey Him and love Him. Thus Ben Sirach can call upon Him: 'O Lord, Father and Master of my life'.<sup>4</sup> There is little of this in Justin. God is πατήρ τῶν ὅλων or πατήρ τῶν πάντων e.g. 'He who appeared to Abraham under the oak of Mamre is God sent to judge Sodom by another τοῦ ἐν τοῖς ὑπερστανίοις ἀεὶ μένοντος καὶ ἡδενὶ ὀφθέντος ἢ ὀμιλήσαντος δι' ἑαυτοῦ ποτε ὅν ποιητὴν τῶν ὅλων καὶ πατέρα νοοῦμεν'.<sup>5</sup> This idea of ὁ πατήρ τῶν πάντων is a frequent one in the Gnostic literature. It

<sup>1</sup> I Apol. viii, 1.

<sup>2</sup> The verb δημιουργεῖν is also rare and late viz. Wisd. xv, 13; II Macc. x, 2; IV Macc. vii, 8. In the N.T. only δημιουργός is found viz. Heb. xi, 10.

<sup>3</sup> Deut. i, 31; cf. viii, 5; Isaiah, i, 2; Psalm, lxxiii, 5.

<sup>4</sup> Ecclus. xxiii, 1.

<sup>5</sup> Dial. lvi, 1.

appears in the *Hermetica* as ὁ δὲ νοῦς πατήρ θεός<sup>1</sup> and more exactly: ὁ δὲ πάντων πατήρ ὁ νοῦς, ὃν ζῶν καὶ φῶς.<sup>2</sup> Simon Magus laid claim to the title.<sup>3</sup> Saturninus taught that there was one Father<sup>4</sup> and the Father was supreme in the system of Basileides.<sup>5</sup> Cerdo claimed that the Father of Jesus was not the same person as the God of the Law and the Prophets.<sup>6</sup> Similarly Marcion stated that the Father is above the God who made the world.<sup>7</sup>

We might well enquire at this point if there is a possibility of Justin's being influenced by Gnosticism in this usage. We can recall that Theophilus of Antioch identifies πατήρ with τὰ πάντα, possibly under Stoic influence from Middle Platonist eclecticism:  
πατέρα ἔαν εἴπω, τὰ πάντα αὐτὸν λέγω.<sup>8</sup> One does not associate πατήρ often with Stoic terminology, but it does appear in Cleanthes' *Hymn to Zeus*, a treasury of Stoic teaching.<sup>9</sup> In order to live at peace with the Divine Law, the assistance of God the Father is requested. Epictetus declares that man is a citizen of the cosmos, fully capable of understanding the divine management of it; man is a son, completely obedient in every respect, honouring the Father and cooperating with Him. In this passage we read πάντα τὰ αὐτοῦ ἡγεῖσθαι τοῦ πατρὸς.<sup>10</sup> For Epictetus, Divine Providence became a personal and transcendent Father. The Creator in the words of Zeno and nearly all the Stoics to the time of Epictetus (1st/2nd century A.D.) was the Father. But it is not a word frequently encountered in their writings.

<sup>1</sup> *Corpus Herm.* (Poimandres) I, I, 6 (ed. Nock).

<sup>2</sup> *ibid.* I, I, 12; cf. I, I, 21: ὁ πατήρ τῶν ὅλων; I, I, 31: ἅγιος ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατήρ τῶν ὅλων.

<sup>3</sup> *Iren. Haer.* I, 23, 1.

<sup>4</sup> *ibid.* I, 24, 1.

<sup>5</sup> *ibid.* I, 24, 3.

<sup>6</sup> *ibid.* I, 27, 1.

<sup>7</sup> *ibid.* I, 27, 2.

<sup>8</sup> *Theoph. ad Autol.* 1, 3.

<sup>9</sup> *Stoic. Vet. Frag.* I, 537, 34.

<sup>10</sup> *Epict. Diss.* ii, 10, 1-14.



The word is extensively used by the Middle Platonists, especially in connection with creation. Philo employs the idea: τῷ δὲ πάντων πατρὶ θεῷ τὰ μὲν ὁπουδαῖα δι' αὐτοῦ μόνου ποιεῖν οἰκειότατον ἦν.<sup>1</sup> Albinus describes the first Νοῦς as: πατήρ δέ ἐστι τῷ αἰτίος εἶναι πάντων καὶ κοσμεῖν τὸν οὐράνιον νοῦν καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν τοῦ κοσμοῦ πρὸς ἑαυτὸν καὶ πρὸς τὰς ἑαυτοῦ νοήσεις.<sup>2</sup> Maximus of Tyre describes his Supreme God as θεὸς εἰς πάντων βασιλεὺς καὶ πατήρ.<sup>3</sup> Numenius in the words of Proclus, says: πατέρα μὲν καλεῖ τὸν πρῶτον.<sup>4</sup> Ultimately these ideas were derived from the Timaeus where the creator is described as ποιητὴς καὶ πατήρ τοῦ παντός.<sup>5</sup>

With these ideas forming the framework for his ideas about God, it is not surprising that at times Justin uses expressions which suggest that God at the Creation put into order pre-existing matter<sup>6</sup> in spite of his declaration that the world was begotten or created de nihilo.<sup>7</sup> In his creative role as Father, God is seen by Justin to be completely transcendent and he denies the Stoic principle that God is immanent in the cosmos. He believes that such a view of God the Father is contrary to reason and sense if He is nothing else than the things which are τρεπόμενα καὶ ἀλλοιούμενα καὶ ἀναλυόμενα εἰς τὰ αὐτὰ ἀεί.<sup>8</sup> God, the ineffable Father and Lord of all, neither has come to any place,

<sup>1</sup> Philo, de Opif. Mund. 74; cf. 10; de Plant. ii,9; de Somn. i,141.

<sup>2</sup> Albinus, Didask. x,3 (ed. Hermann).

<sup>3</sup> Max. Tyr. Philosoph. xi, 5a-b (Hobein).

<sup>4</sup> Proclus, in Platonis Timaeum commentarii, I, p. 303,27 (Diehl) =

Numenius, Frag. (E. des Places), Frag. 21, p.60.

<sup>5</sup> Plat. Tim. 28,c.

<sup>6</sup> e.g. I Apol. x,2; lix,1; II Apol. v (vi),3.

<sup>7</sup> e.g. Dial. v.

<sup>8</sup> II Apol. vi (vii),9.

nor walks, nor sleeps, nor rises up, but remains in his own place wherever that may be. In this way change and motion in a spatial sense are alien to His nature.<sup>1</sup> But elsewhere in Justin, God is ὑπὲρ κόσμου ... ὑπὲρ ὧν ἄλλος οὐκ ἔστι.<sup>2</sup> Sometimes God is present ἐν τοῖς ὑπερουρανίοις.<sup>3</sup> He cannot leave His super-celestial business: καταλιπόντα τὰ ὑπὲρ οὐρανὸν ἅπαντα.<sup>4</sup> Although there appears a contradiction here between a non-spatial God and the fact that God is in the heavens, Justin might have been toying with a very real Gnostic belief. The dilemmas which faced the Christian trained in Greek philosophical method are apparent at this point.

When Justin held to a completely transcendent God who was yet 'in heaven' and 'in his own place',<sup>5</sup> he is moving in as deeply troubled waters as those who accept the curious involutions of Tillich's thinking in the 20th century A.D. 'To call God transcendent does not mean that one must establish a 'superworld' of divine objects. It does mean that, within itself, the finite world points beyond itself. In other words, it is self transcendent.'<sup>6</sup> J.A.T. Robinson accepts this as a great contribution i.e. the reinterpretation of transcendence in a way which preserves its reality detaching it from the projection of supranaturalism.<sup>7</sup> The concept of alien life is one of the cardinal principles of Gnosticism. The Gnostics' God was 'the alien God', 'the Unknown', 'the Nameless God'. The unknown Father appears as 'absolute transcendence' in Neoplatonism. St. Paul fumbles for the same idea: 'so too no-one has understood the thinking of God except the Spirit of God'.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Dial. cxxvii,2.

<sup>2</sup> ibid. lx,5.

<sup>3</sup> ibid. lvi,1; cxxvii,5; cxxix,1.

<sup>4</sup> ibid. lx,2.

<sup>5</sup> Dial. cxxvii,2.

<sup>6</sup> P. Tillich, Systematic Theology, ii, p.8.

<sup>7</sup> J.A.T. Robinson, Honest to God, SCM (1963), p.56.

<sup>8</sup> I Cor. ii,11.



J.A.T. Robinson believes that this 'Spirit of God' is nothing alien to us, but the very ground of our own true being.<sup>1</sup> H. Jonas discusses the significance of 'the Alien' and concludes that 'the Alien' taken absolutely is the wholly transcendent, the 'beyond' and eminent attribute of God.<sup>2</sup> The idea of an absolute 'without' limits the world to a closed and bounded system, terrifying in its vastness to those who are lost in it.<sup>3</sup> But it is this kind of absolute transcendency, familiar to the Gnostics, which Justin points towards, when he places his God ἐν τοῖς ὑπερουρανίοις or even ὑπὲρ τὸ οὐρανόν • God is still the transcendent God of Greek philosophy as ἀπαθής and we have dedicated ourselves Θεῷ δὲ τῷ ἀγεννήτῳ καὶ ἀπαθείᾳ .<sup>4</sup> He is consequently exempt from change and decay like the Platonist God described by Diogenes Laertius: οὕτω γὰρ μάλιστα φθορᾶς καὶ πάθους ἀνεπίδεκτον ὑπάρχειν .<sup>5</sup> This quality of ἀπαθεία was the quality ascribed to divinity by the Stoa so that God was free not only from pain and emotion, but also from any other form of experience. Athenagoras refers to God as Θεὸς ἀγέννητος καὶ ἀπαθής .<sup>6</sup> Similarly Plutarch wishes to make the distance between God and His creation as great as he can. Consequently he calls God as the First Principle ἀρχὴς καὶ ἀπαθής .<sup>7</sup>

The quality of ἀπαθεία is not ascribed to God either in the LXX or the N.T. None of the word's cognate forms appears either. This fact and the fact that Justin uses it quite naturally confirm our view

<sup>1</sup> op. cit. p.59.

<sup>2</sup> H. Jonas, The Gnostic Religion, pp.48 - 51.

<sup>3</sup> ibid. p.51.

<sup>4</sup> I Apol. xxv,2.

<sup>5</sup> Diog. Laert. iii,77 (Loeb).

<sup>6</sup> Athenag. Leg. viii,3; of. Clem. Strom. ii,16. (ed. Stählin).

<sup>7</sup> Plut. de Isid. 373 B (Loeb).

that Justin's God was far from being the personal God of the O.T. and N.T. Yet Justin has no difficulty in spite of God's ἀπαθεία in giving Him location: God ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ χώρᾳ, ὅπου ποτε, μένει.<sup>1</sup> We have seen above that God is sometimes above the heavens, sometimes in the heavens. There is some evidence that a desire to be less than vague about God's location resulted from debate with the Gnostics.<sup>2</sup> A Christian writer could not be completely happy with Aristotle's unmoved mover for whom Aristotle as much as later Platonist writers employed all the terminology which Plato applied to his Idea (especially that of the Good). That Justin came down on the side of a spatial location of God whether above or in the heavens is an indication that he was in a dialogue with Gnostics.

But Justin does not escape a charge of Gnosticism when he claims of God: τῷ ὑπὲρ κόσμου θεῷ, ὑπὲρ ὃν ἄλλος οὐκ ἔστι.<sup>3</sup> Whether Justin deliberately makes ὑπὲρ ὃν ambiguous or not, the sense hardly rejects Gnostic beliefs in an 'alien beyond' above the cosmos or an unknown God above the O.T. God. Justin is following a similar strain of thought as Philo: 'God is called place, because he contains all things, but is contained by none ... the Divine, being contained by nothing, is necessarily its own place'.<sup>4</sup> 'God is His own place and He is filled by Himself and sufficient for Himself, filling and containing all other things, but Himself contained by nothing else, seeing that He is Himself One and the Whole.'<sup>5</sup> There is more than a trace of Stoicism here in the identity of the World Soul with matter. Theophilus makes the same point: ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ἑαυτοῦ τόπος.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Dial. cxxvii, 2.

<sup>2</sup> e.g. Irenaeus, adv. Haer. II, 1, 1; Tertull. adv. Marc. I, iii, 11 (Migne); Adamantius, Dial. 2, 1-2; (ed. Förster); cf. R.M. Grant, The Early Christian Doctrine of God, pp. 109-110.

<sup>3</sup> Dial. lx, 5.

<sup>4</sup> Philo, de Somn. i, 63.

<sup>5</sup> id. Leg. Alleg. i, 44.

<sup>6</sup> Theoph. ad Autol. ii, 10.



Although heaven in the Bible is God's dwelling place<sup>1</sup> and the God of heaven is the frequent designation of God in canonical and uncanonical books alike, God's terrestrial abode was at first the tabernacle and later the temple. At the dedication of Solomon's temple, the cloud which held God's glory completely filled the temple.<sup>2</sup> But the writer of the Book of Baruch thinks of God's house as being the entire universe.<sup>3</sup> Although the Jews wished to express a belief that God was everywhere present, this was not necessarily a conceiving of God as the Stoic anima mundi. Their interest was religious rather than speculative. In the Wisdom of Solomon, the expression occurs: 'no-one who gives utterance to unjust speech can escape [God's] notice'.<sup>4</sup> Similarly in the Letter of Aristeas: 'nothing of all that men do secretly on earth, escapes Him'.<sup>5</sup> This is precisely the view of Justin: 'it is alike impossible for the wicked ... to escape the notice of God'.<sup>6</sup> This is also the note which Philo struck before him: 'God has left nothing, no matter how solitary, void of himself'.<sup>7</sup>

Yet although Justin introduces the idea of universal location into a concept of transcendency, possibly under the impetus of a dialogue with Gnosticism (and not necessarily Jewish), he is unswerving in his application of Greek philosophical terminology to God. His Supreme One is ἀτρεπτον καὶ ἀεὶ ὄντα θεόν καὶ γεννητόρα τῶν πάντων.<sup>8</sup> None of these terms is found

<sup>1</sup> I Kings, viii, 30-49; Psalms, ii, 4 etc.

<sup>2</sup> I Kings, viii, 10 f.

<sup>3</sup> Baruch, iii, 24 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Wisd. i, 7f.

<sup>5</sup> Aristeas, 132f. (Eng. trans. Charles; Greek Tx. Swete).

<sup>6</sup> I Apol. xii, 1; xii, 3; II Apol. xii, 4; xii, 6. See above p. 36.

<sup>7</sup> Philo, Leg. Alleg. iii, 4. On God as τὸ πᾶν, embracing everything and embraced by nothing, see de Somn. i, 63 ff.

<sup>8</sup> I Apol. xiii, 4.

in the LXX as a description of God. <sup>21</sup> ἀτρέπτες occurs only in a single reference in the Symmachus at Job, xv, 15. It is not a N.T. term either. But it seems to have been the name of the ultimate principle of existence in Valentinian Gnosticism.<sup>1</sup> It became a term used with great frequency in later patristic writers. When Justin says that God must not be identified with things τρέπόμενα καὶ ἀλλοιούμενα καὶ ἀναλυόμενα εἰς τὰ αὐτὰ ἀεί, he is consciously rejecting the basic concept of Stoicism that the world was not static and that God is as changeable as matter of which He is its essence.

The Stoics had taken the philosophy of Heraclitus very much to their hearts. For Heraclitus everything was in a constant state of flux: πάντα ... εἶναι, εἶναι. δὲ παγίως οὐθέν.<sup>2</sup> Plato also applied this principle to the things of the sensible world: τὰ ὄντα ἰέναι τε πάντα καὶ μένειν οὐδέν ... πάντα χωρεῖ καὶ οὐδὲν μένει.<sup>3</sup> Plato was not apprehensive about the consequent instability of the sensible world since his theory of Ideas presented him with the permanent element. Aristotle too brought the concept of the Unmoved Mover into the changeableness of the sensible world. This is the framework of concepts taken over by the Middle Platonists. This eternal and inflexible unchangeableness of God appears in some of the writers of the N.T. Jesus urges the woman of Samaria not to worship the God associated with the local things of the mountain and of the temple.<sup>4</sup> The words ascribed to Jesus here are in harmony with His sayings about the end of the Temple and its substitution by the universal Fatherhood of God. The unchangeable nature of Jesus occurs in the Epistle to the Hebrews where Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, and today and for ever.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> e.g. Epiph. Haer. xxxi, 5 (Migne).

<sup>2</sup> Aristot. de Caelo III, 1, 298b 30.

<sup>3</sup> Plato, Crat. 401D; 402A.

<sup>4</sup> John, iv, 21-24.

<sup>5</sup> Heb. xiii, 8.



There are many parallels in Philo where God ἤκιστα τρέπεσθαι καὶ μεταβολαῖς χρῆσθαι πεφυκός.<sup>1</sup> He speaks also of παρόντος ἀνίδρυτον καὶ ἀστατον κατέιδε τὴν γένεσιν, ὅτε τὴν περὶ τὸ ὄν ἀνεκδοιότατον ἐγνώ βεβαιότητά .<sup>2</sup> The words τρέπω and κινῶ are important words in Middle Platonism and when Justin uses ἀτρέπτος, he is thinking of the Unmoved Mover and the total stability of God's nature. God is τὸ κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ καὶ ὡσαύτως αἰεὶ ἔχον,<sup>3</sup> a Platonist expression which is completely non-Jewish.

In the expression where Justin uses ἀτρέπτος of God, he also adds that He is γεννήτωρ τῶν πάντων.<sup>4</sup> Up to this point, the tenor of our argument has been that Justin has no marked view of the relationship which the Bible sees as existing between the Father and His children. He accepts a supreme God with sovereignty and domination as His principal attributes. Justin is more at home with the concept of the transcendent God, the Unmoved Mover of the Middle Platonist school.

We noted how Justin attempted to solve the paradox which faced him. If he postulated a completely transcendent God who was totally other, he might in fact be approaching in too uncompromising a way a definition of the Gnostic Unknowable God. For that reason, he assigned God's own place above the heavens or in the heavens to Him and we thought there might be some evidence to indicate that this was a lively issue between Christian and Gnostic believers. There is further evidence that Justin wished to personalize the Unmoved Mover and we see this demonstrated in his use of the term γεννήτωρ τῶν πάντων. We have seen how Justin employs apophatic terminology to describe God. But he continuously struck a balance between ideas about the ἀπείρος or ἀόριστος God of Middle Platonism and the more literal ideas of Judaism. If God was only ἀπείρος, although

<sup>1</sup> Philo, de Gigant. 48.

<sup>2</sup> id. quod Deus Immut. 4; cf. de Posteritate Caini, 20.

<sup>3</sup> Dial. iii, 5.

<sup>4</sup> I Apol. xiii, 4.

this did not mean in Greek philosophy that He was without limitation or completely undetermined, He was nevertheless an ill-defined, shadowy kind of entity, as the term signifies. The Greeks took a long time to get away from the notion of τὸ ἀπείρον, the unlimited, universal material from which all things derive and to which all things will return - an idea appearing as early as Anaximander in the 6th century B.C.

A God who was so formless and so infinitely unbounded was not a concept favoured by Justin. He demonstrates this by his use of the term γεννήτωρ τῶν πάντων.<sup>1</sup> Justin did not abstract this idea from Biblical sources since γεννήτωρ does not occur in the LXX or the N.T. It is an expression known both to Plato<sup>2</sup> and to Aristotle.<sup>3</sup> It is not however a frequent title of God. On inscriptions, I can only find it used once.<sup>4</sup> Such an attribute is a personal one. It is more meaningful to a Christian than terms like ὁ κτίστης or ὁ ποιητής etc. The term did not become more popular even later.<sup>5</sup> It is even more startling that creation as a specific attribute of God is much less frequent than one might expect in the Biblical and Pseudepigraphical literature.<sup>6</sup> We find concepts like ὁ κτίσας and ὁ κτίστης in the N.T.<sup>7</sup>; the same words used of the Creator in the O.T. are somewhat more frequent.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> I Apol. xiii,4; xxi,5.

<sup>2</sup> Plat. Leg. 878A.

<sup>3</sup> Aristot. de Mundo. 397 b 21 (Loeb).

<sup>4</sup> Inscr. Graec. (ed. Dittenberger), iii,636.

<sup>5</sup> Athanas. Arian. i,14: ὁ πατήρ ἀρχὴ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ γεννήτωρ ἐστὶ (ed. Bright); id. ep. Aeg. Lib. 16 (Migne).

<sup>6</sup> e.g. I Enoch, lxxxi,5 (ed. Charles); Assumpt. Mos. x,10 (ed. Charles).

<sup>7</sup> Rom. i,25; I Pet. iv,19.

<sup>8</sup> e.g. Eccles. xii,1.



An interesting fact is the considerable flexibility with which the different writers of the LXX translate the Hebrew words for creation. For example for  $\text{אֱלֹהִים}$  at Genesis, xiv,19,22, the LXX translator reads:  $\text{ὁς ἐκτίσεν τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν}$ .<sup>1</sup> Yet where a similar idea occurs at Isaiah, xl,28, the LXX writer does not use  $\text{κτίσῃ}$ , but reads:  $\text{ὁ θεὸς ὁ κατασκευάσας τὰ ἄκρα τῆς γῆς}$  and the Hebrew reads  $\text{אֱלֹהִים}$ .<sup>2</sup> A similar LXX Graecism appears in Isaiah, xliii,15:  $\text{ὁ θεὸς ὁ ἅγιος ὑμῶν ὁ καταδείξας Ἰσραὴλ βασιλεὺς ὑμῶν}$  where the Hebrew reads  $\text{אֱלֹהִים}$  again.<sup>3</sup> Justin uses the highly personalized dominant Greek background and compromises with his concept of the Unmoved Mover. He is in accord with the over-riding purpose of many early Christians whose primary efforts were devoted to maintain the unity and power of God the Father. Throughout Acts, St. Paul is shown to be engaged in such an effort and this is demonstrated too in his contacts with Christian communities elsewhere.<sup>4</sup> In this context, Justin is seen in his role, traditionally interpreted, as a principal figure in the early Christian mission to displace the beliefs in a classical Pantheon, to make more credible a belief in a God different from the gods of the oriental cults and to establish a faith in one God, the Father, Creator and Governor of the world. Here was the answer given by Christians under inquisition by their tormentors: 'There is one God and Father of us all, who made heaven and earth.'<sup>5</sup> Nothing could be further from Justin's appellative of  $\text{γεννητὴρ}$  for God than the more extreme Gnostic beliefs in a world created by demons and hostile powers.

In this context, we must note that Justin designates God as  $\text{ἀγεννητος}$ . This term is not found in the LXX or in the N.T. It is a term used by Justin as an attribute of God<sup>6</sup> often in conjunction with

<sup>1</sup>A.V. 'the possessor of heaven and earth'; N.E.B. 'Creator of Heaven and Earth'.

<sup>2</sup>A.V. 'the Creator of the ends of the earth'; N.E.B.

<sup>3</sup>A.V. 'I am the Lord, the creator of Israel'; N.E.B.

<sup>4</sup>e.g. I Thess. i,9.

<sup>5</sup>of. Tertull. Apol. xvii, (Migne.).

<sup>6</sup>I Apol. xiv,1,2; xxv,2; xlix,5; liii,2; II Apol. xii,4; xiii,4; Dial. v,1,4; cxiv,3; cxxvi,2; cxxvii,1.

ἀρετῆτος : e.g. we worship and love τὸν ἀπὸ ἀγέννητου  
καὶ ἀρετῆτος Θεοῦ λόγον.<sup>1</sup> But it is necessary to point out  
that whenever in Justin this attribute is applied to God, there is no  
hint that we are being drawn into any intimate relationship with Him.  
Justin either uses the word as a simple attribute of God when discussing  
the origin of the Word or of Christ, or if he uses the term to describe  
God without mentioning the Son, he is urging Christians to dedicate their  
lives to the Unbegotten God. At no time are Christians urged by Justin  
to love or to reverence the Unbegotten God. We merely have the  
Unbegotten God as witness or we have the fact that we should dedicate  
ourselves, whatever that means, to the Unbegotten God.<sup>2</sup>

Justin invariably uses the term ἀγέννητος of God, and never  
ἀγενήτος. Otto commented<sup>3</sup> that this consistent use of ἀγέννητος was  
the fault of a copyist since he considered that there were passages in  
Justin where ἀγενήτος would be more appropriate e.g. μόνος γὰρ  
ἀγέννητος καὶ ἀφθαρτος ὁ Θεός where the contrast is being  
pointed to the fact that God did not come into existence and will not  
cease to exist.<sup>4</sup> Goodenough also thought that Justin confused the words  
and did not understand the difference between the two.<sup>5</sup> L.W. Barnard  
does not commit himself to an opinion when he refers in detail to  
Goodenough's comments.<sup>6</sup> E.F. Osborn does not discuss any difficulty and  
seeks to justify Justin's consistent use of ἀγέννητος as  
differentiating between God and all other beings.<sup>7</sup> Goodenough's analysis

<sup>1</sup> II Apol. xiii,4; cf. II Apol. xii,4; Dial. cxvi,2.

<sup>2</sup> e.g. I Apol. xiv,2: νῦν ἀγαθῶ καὶ ἀγεννήτῳ Θεῷ ἑαυτοὺς  
ἀνατεθεικότες. The verb ἀνατιθέναι is found everywhere in the  
sense of dedicating to a god e.g. Thuc. i,13: Ῥήνειαυ ἀνέθηκε  
τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι.

<sup>3</sup> J.C.T. Otto, S. Justini Philosophi et Martyris Opera, Jena, 3rd ed.  
Cap. V,n.1.

<sup>4</sup> Dial. V, passim.

<sup>5</sup> E. Goodenough, The Theology of Justin Martyr, p.130.

<sup>6</sup> L.W. Barnard, Justin Martyr: His Life and Thought, pp.80-81.

<sup>7</sup> E.F. Osborn, Justin Martyr, p.21. On the two words, see Lightfoot,  
Apostolic Fathers, II, 1 (1885), pp.90-94. For a full discussion, see  
J. Lebreton, ἀγέννητος dans la tradition et dans la littérature  
chrétienne du II<sup>e</sup> siècle, 'Recherches de Science religieuses' (1926),  
p.442.



of the two terms is accurate<sup>1</sup>. ἀγένητος applied to the Deity expresses the fact that He has no beginning, that He is superior to change and decay. Philo uses the word in precisely that sense too.<sup>2</sup> ἀγένητος means 'unbegotten' and although it is a rarer word when applied to the Ultimate, it is found in Aristotle in a close definition: 'if there is nothing eternal, neither can there be any coming into existence; for any real thing which comes into existence necessarily presupposes some real thing from which it came into existence, and the last term of such a series must be ἀγένητος.'<sup>3</sup> The words provide a fertile field for copyists' errors.<sup>4</sup> One also must note the distinction between the bases γέννημα and γένημα, the former referring to animal (and therefore organically personal) in the LXX and the latter vegetable (and therefore non-personal) as in the N.T.<sup>5</sup> Such an emphasis would accord well with the purpose of Justin and his desire to acknowledge a strong element of the person in his otherwise supreme Unmoved Mover.<sup>6</sup>

We have noted above that God was ὁ γενητὴς τῶν πάντων for Justin. As such God is more than ὁ κτίστης and more than ὁ ποιητής. The term ποιητής for creator is not found in the LXX and it is not used in the N.T. in this sense. It is rare in classical Greek, its most well known occurrence appearing in Plato's Timaeus 28C:

<sup>1</sup> Goodenough, loc. cit. p.129.

<sup>2</sup> Philo, de sacrif. Abel et Cain. 57; 60; quis rer. div. haer. 206.

<sup>3</sup> Aristotle, Metaph. B,4. 999b, 7ff.

<sup>4</sup> e.g. Athenag. Leg. 10,1 where the manuscript (designated A) copied by Baanes reads ἀγένητον as opposed to the Arethas codex reading of ἀγένητος. See W.R. Schoedel, Athenagoras (Oxford Early Christian Texts) (1971) p.xxxv.

<sup>5</sup> J.H. Moulton and G. Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament, p.123.

<sup>6</sup> In later controversy, the Arians exploited the use of the word ἀγένητος. They maintained stoutly that this was the essence of the Godhead and that the Son, because γέννητος, was inferior. They further accused the orthodox, because the latter used ἀγένητος and γέννητος, of postulating two natures.





J. Skinner says that although partly synonymous, there is a specific shade of (different) meaning between the two words.<sup>1</sup>  $\chi\tau\tau$  is used exclusively of divine activity, a restriction with no parallels in other languages. It includes an idea of novelty or extraordinariness of result. It contains an idea of effortless production by word or volition and the sense of the word stops short of creatio ex nihilo. If these shades of meaning exist in  $\pi\tau\tau$  and  $\kappa\tau\tau$ , they are extremely refined.  $\pi\tau\tau$  is used of 'making' or 'producing' something material e.g. manufactured articles, works of art.<sup>2</sup> It was also used of 'creating', 'bringing into existence' viz. 'to beget', 'to conceive', 'to produce'.<sup>3</sup>  $\kappa\tau\tau$  was used of peopling a country, building houses and cities, founding and establishing.<sup>4</sup> It was a favourite word of the poets used of creating or bringing into being.<sup>5</sup>  $\kappa\tau\tau$  would seem to have a sense wherein order and form were given to existing material. The idea of novelty implicit in  $\chi\tau\tau$  is inbuilt into the idea of re-arranging pre-existing material into a new form as expressed by  $\kappa\tau\tau$ .

It is not being suggested that  $\kappa\tau\tau$  invariably differs from  $\pi\tau\tau$  by distinguishing between creation ex nihilo and creation by re-arranging pre-existent material into novel forms. But on occasions there seems to be this particular connotation in  $\kappa\tau\tau$ . Theophilus of Antioch makes a distinction between  $\kappa\tau\tau$ ,  $\pi\tau\tau$  and  $\delta\eta\mu\iota\upsilon\rho\gamma\acute{o}s$ .<sup>6</sup> Athanasius cites Dionysius writing in the 3rd century A.D:  $\text{o}\acute{\upsilon}\chi\iota\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \gamma\epsilon\ \tau\acute{o}\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\iota\beta\epsilon\ \nu\acute{\upsilon}\nu\ \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omicron\iota\tau'\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\omicron\iota\eta\beta\epsilon\ \cdot\ \delta\iota\alpha\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\iota\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \pi\omicron\iota\eta\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\iota\ \tau\acute{o}\ \kappa\tau\iota\beta\alpha\iota.$ <sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> International Critical Commentary, Genesis, pp.14-15.

<sup>2</sup> e.g. Herodot. vii,65; Xen. Anab. v,3,9; cf. on works of art of all periods.

<sup>3</sup> e.g. Plutarch, 2,312a; ibid. 145d (ed. Bernadakis).

<sup>4</sup> e.g. Herodot. i,149; iii,49; Thuc. vi,4,2; Tat. ad. Graec. xxxvi,1; xxxix,3. The epithet  $\kappa\tau\tau$  might even be applied to gods as mythical founders of a city e.g.  $[\Delta]_{106}\kappa\acute{o}\rho\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \kappa\tau\tau[\alpha\varsigma\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \pi\acute{o}\lambda\epsilon\omega\varsigma\ldots$  (from Moesia), L'Année Epigraphique (1966), no.370, p.103.

<sup>5</sup> e.g. Aesch. Suppl. 172; Soph. Oed. Col. 715.

<sup>6</sup> Theoph. ad Autol. iii,9; cf. i,4: God is  $\delta\eta\mu\iota\upsilon\rho\gamma\acute{o}s\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\omicron\iota\eta\tau\eta\varsigma\ \delta\iota\alpha\ \tau\acute{o}\ \alpha\acute{\upsilon}\tau\omicron\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\iota\nu\alpha\iota\ \kappa\tau\tau\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\omicron\iota\eta\tau\eta\varsigma\ \tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \acute{\omicron}\lambda\omega\nu.$

<sup>7</sup> Dion. Rom. ap. Athanas. Decr. Nic. Syn. xxvi (Migne).

The formidable Gregory Nyssen specifically denies this.<sup>1</sup> Justin employs both *κτίσις* and *ποίησις* as we noted above. They are words which describe the cosmic functions of God, acceptable to Greek philosophers and later biblical writers alike.

Justin adds an entirely new dimension to these cosmic functions when he uses the term *γεννήτωρ τῶν πάντων*. Using this expression, he states unequivocally that God who created and directed the universe was more than a first cause or even a causal agent. Causality was a favourite topic in Greek metaphysics as much as in Judaism. Gnosticism did not acknowledge the O.T. God as a Creator and in some gnostic writings, God as the God of the world of matter was believed to be the God of evil. God *ὁ γεννήτωρ* was He who begat the universe, He who spawned the universe, He who brought forth the Universe from Himself. There is sufficient Stoicism in this concept to satisfy Justin intellectually and to avoid a contradiction of his fundamental tenet of a transcendent God. But *ὁ γεννήτωρ* as an attribute of the Creator makes Him more than a cosmic cause. God Himself was a personal Creator and there was none higher. The responsibility of God for creation was put above question. But the anonymous author of de Mundo had expressed a similar idea possibly a century earlier:  
*ὡςτὴρ μὲν γὰρ ὅντως πάντων ἔστι καὶ γενέτωρ τῶν ὁπωσδήποτε.*<sup>2</sup>

Justin however, no matter how he has tried to personalize his Supreme Principle, still does not have a doctrine of God, based on a close moral relationship resulting from His covenant of providential love for His people. Justin in the end was postulating a physical or metaphysical concept. Nevertheless, the idea of Justin's namely that God is the Begetter of all things, is more than just a Stoic idea quoted by St. Paul: *τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἑβμέν*,<sup>3</sup> although this sentiment

<sup>1</sup> Greg. Nyss. con. Eun. 4 (Migne).

<sup>2</sup> de Mundo, 397b (Loeb); cf. Scholia, ed. E. Maass, Commentariorum in Aratum reliquiae (Berlin, 1898), p.332, 10f.

<sup>3</sup> Acts, xvii, 28.



has for its antecedents Hellenistic teaching. For example, Plato states: τὸ τοῦ κόσμου ὅλον ἐγεννήθη.<sup>1</sup> Aristotle takes up a similar position: ὁ ἐξ ἁωμάτου γεννῶν λόγος.<sup>2</sup> As one might expect, the Middle Platonists retain the idea since Albinus reads: ἐξ ἐκάστου τῶν στοιχείων ἐγεννήθη (τὸν κόσμον) διανοηθεὶς ... ἐκ γῆς αὐτὸν καὶ πῦρ ἐποίησεν.<sup>3</sup> Plotinus develops the idea of God ὁ γεννήτωρ even further: καὶ πάντα δὲ ὅσα ἤδη τέλεια γεννᾷ. τὸ δὲ αἰὲν τέλειον αἰὲν καὶ αἰδίου γεννᾷ. καὶ ἑλάττω δὲ ἑαυτοῦ γεννᾷ.<sup>4</sup>

A further insight into the relationship of the Son to the Father is given to us by Justin's use of another expression. 'By the will of God' is an expression which constantly occurs in his writings. In the O.T. there is a close association between command and obedience. The link between the two is the will of God. The Lord's Prayer illustrates the use of the expression.<sup>5</sup> There are several echoes in the N.T. of the prayer γενήθῃ τὸ θέλημά σου.<sup>6</sup> The execution of God's will is seen as the supreme purpose of life. The created cosmos exists and was created διὰ τὸ θέλημά σου.<sup>7</sup> The implications in certain passages of Genesis are that creation depended on God's will.<sup>8</sup> The creation of man results from the same act of God's will.<sup>9</sup> Principles of man's conduct and the purpose of his life are based on observance of God's will.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Plat. Tim. 32C (Loeb).

<sup>2</sup> Aristotle, Cael. 305 a 16.

<sup>3</sup> Albinus, Didask. xii (ed. Hermann).

<sup>4</sup> Plot. Enn. v, 1, 6, 37f.

<sup>5</sup> Matt. vi, 9-13; Luke, xi, 2-4.

<sup>6</sup> e.g. Matt. xxvi, 42 (of. xxvi, 39; Mark, xiv, 36); Luke, xxi, 42: πλὴν μὴ τὸ θέλημά μου ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν γενέσθω; Acts, xxi, 14: τοῦ Κυρίου τὸ θέλημα γινέσθω; of. Mart. Polyc. vii, 1: τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ γενέσθω.

<sup>7</sup> Rev. iv, 11.

<sup>8</sup> e.g. Gen. i, 3; i, 6; of. Psalm, xxxiii, 9.

<sup>9</sup> James, i, 18.

<sup>10</sup> e.g. John, vii, 17; Rom. xii, 2; Col. iv, 12.

The Middle Platonists also speculated on the importance of the Divine Will. In Plato, the Divine Will was linked with Divine Goodness and the doctrines of the Middle Platonists on the subject were founded on passages like Timaeus 29E-30A: πάντα ὅτι μάλιστα γενέσθαι ἐβουλήθη παραπλήρεια ἑαυτῷ ... βουληθεὶς γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἀγαθὰ μὲν πάντα. At Alexandria Pantaenus could state that God θελήματι τὰ πάντα προήκε and he claims to know what truly exists as being ὡς ἴδια θελήματα of God.<sup>1</sup> The importance of the Divine Will in creation is also stated by Albinus: ὁ μὲν γὰρ θεὸς τοῦ τε παντός ὑπάρχει ποιητῆς αὐτὸς καὶ τῶν θεῶν τε καὶ δαιμόνων, ὃ δὲ πᾶν λύειν οὐκ ἔχει κατὰ τὴν ἐκείνου βούλησιν.<sup>2</sup> Elsewhere he says that God κατὰ γὰρ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ βούλησιν ἐμπέπληκε πάντα ἑαυτοῦ.<sup>3</sup>

It is in this context that Justin uses expressions like 'in accordance with the will of God. Thus it is τῇ βουλῇ of God that Jesus Christ became man.<sup>4</sup> κατὰ τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς πάντων καὶ δεσπότης θεοῦ βουλήν Jesus was born of a virgin as man.<sup>5</sup> νῦν δὲ διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ Jesus became man for the human race.<sup>6</sup> Later in the same passage, Jesus became man by a virgin κατὰ τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς βουλήν.<sup>7</sup> Time and time again we have a reference to the incarnation in Justin's works, frequently modified by some variant of κατὰ τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς βουλήν.<sup>8</sup> The blood of Jesus did not spring from the seed of man, but ἐκ θελήματος θεοῦ.<sup>9</sup> We are reminded of the Prologue of St. John: οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος ἀνδρὸς, ἀλλ' ἐκ θεοῦ.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>1</sup> R.E. Witt, Albinus, p.130 (with refs.).

<sup>2</sup> Albinus, Didask. xv,2 (ed. Hermann).

<sup>3</sup> ibid. x,3.

<sup>4</sup> I Apol. xxiii,2.

<sup>5</sup> ibid. xlvi,5.

<sup>6</sup> ibid. lxiii,10.

<sup>7</sup> ibid. lxiii,16.

<sup>8</sup> e.g. II Apol. vi,5; Dial. xli,1; lxxv,4; lxxvi,1; lxxvi,7 et al.

<sup>9</sup> Dial. lxiii,2.

<sup>10</sup> John, i,13; cf. Dial. lxiii,2: ὡς τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἐξ ἀνθρώπου σπέρματος γεγεννημένου ἀλλ' ἐκ θελήματος θεοῦ.



It is very clear what Justin intends to say in the twelve or so passages where he makes the will of God the controlling factor in the Incarnation. The Incarnation is consequent upon the will of the Father. Without the active operation of the will of God, there would have been no Incarnation and presumably no Christ whose birth was so dependent on God's will. This is a clear statement of subordinationism. It is the transcendent God and Father of the cosmos who willed the Incarnation and the projection of the Christ-Logos into a material world.<sup>1</sup> Justin owes much to the Middle Platonist concept of the λόγος ἐνδιάθετος and the λόγος πρὸ φθορίκός, although he does not use the terms. The Son is the agent of the Father's will in Justin's view and He actually ministers to the Father's Will.<sup>2</sup>

The Will of God inevitably became an important element in Christological thinking. Developing from ideas such as is expressed in Hermas: ὁ θεὸς τῶν δυνάμεων... δυνάμει κραταῖα καὶ τῇ μεγάλῃ ἐυνεβεί αὐτοῦ κτίσας τὸν κόσμον καὶ τῇ ἐνδοξῇ βουλῇ περιθείς,<sup>3</sup> Christian thought considered that God's will was the cause of angels and spirits<sup>4</sup> and nothing was created apart from it.<sup>5</sup> Ultimately it was considered identical with God's dynamis.<sup>6</sup> Porphyrius developed the Plotinian triad of monē - proodos - epistrophē into Being, Power and Act (οὐσία — δύναμις — ἐνέργεια). God by His Nature (οὐσία) is; and is omnipotent and therefore has the capacity (δύναμις) for all act; and is perfect and so brings all act to perfection (ἐνέργεια).<sup>7</sup> But since God does not act, but as He wills,

<sup>1</sup>cf. Theoph. ad Autol. x: ἔχων οὖν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ λόγον ἐνδιάθετον ἐν ταῖς ἰδίαις ἀπλάγχνοις ; xxii: τοῦτον τὸν λόγον ἐγέννησεν πρὸ φθορίκον . Athenagoras does not use the terms either although he implies them cf. Athenag.

Leg. x,2.

<sup>2</sup>Dial. lxi,1. God's Will is causative of both the Incarnation and the Crucifixion cf. Dial. ciii,3.

<sup>3</sup>Hermas, Vis. I,iii,4.

<sup>4</sup>Hom. Clem. iii,33 (saec. iii-iv) (Migne).

<sup>5</sup>Method. de resurrect. mort. i,36 (ob. 311) (Migne).

<sup>6</sup>Greg. Nyss. hex. 7 (Migne).

<sup>7</sup>The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Mediaeval Philosophy, pp.492-493.

and, being omnipotent, has no Will that He does not accomplish, His power is identical with His Will, and Will may replace dynamis as the middle term of the triad.<sup>1</sup> It became therefore the source of all good.<sup>2</sup>

We have noted how Justin takes a Subordinationist view of the birth of the Son: ΟΥΚ ΕΒΤΙΝ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΙΝΟΝ ΕΡΓΟΝ, ΑΛΛΑ ΤΗΣ ΒΟΥΛΗΣ ΑΥΤΟΥ, ΑΛΛ' ΟΥ ΚΑΤΑ ΑΠΟΤΟΜΗΝ.<sup>3</sup> The concept was adopted by some Arians in the later controversies e.g. ΤΟ ΓΑΡ ΚΕΦΑΛΑΙΟΝ ΕΙΝΑΙ ... ΕΠΙ ΤΗΝ ΒΟΥΛΗΝ ΤΟΥ ΠΑΤΡΟΣ ΑΝΕΝΕΥΚΕΙΝ ΤΟΝ ΥΙΟΝ ΤΗΝ ΓΕΝΕΣΙΝ, ΚΑΙ ΜΗ ΠΑΘΟΣ ΑΠΟΦΗΝΑΙ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ ΤΗΝ ΓΟΝΗΝ.<sup>4</sup> Athanasius records ΟΥΤΩ ΚΑΙ ΑΥΤΟΣ Τῷ ΒΟΥΛΗΜΑΤΙ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ, ΟΥΚ ὩΝ ΠΡΟΤΕΡΟΝ, ΓΕΓΟΝΕΝ.<sup>5</sup> But the anti-Arian orthodox refuted the idea and claimed that the Son was Himself the Βουλὴ of the Father.<sup>6</sup> The controversy continued for many centuries.

There were others interested in the activity of the Βουλὴ of God. There is a passage in Justin's Dialogue where he lists various names given to Christ and in nearly all of the instances which he gives, he supplies the O.T. writer in whose works the names are found. "He ... is called at one time the Angel of great Will (βουλῆς), and a Man by Ezekiel, and like the Son of Man by Daniel, and a child by Isaiah, and Christ and God to be worshipped by David, and Christ and a Stone by many, and Wisdom by Solomon, and Joseph and Judah and a Star by Moses, and the East by Zechariah, and the Suffering One and Jacob and Israel by Isaiah again, and a Rod, and Flower, and Corner-Stone and Son of God".<sup>7</sup> We need to direct our attention to the first name, the ἄγγελος μεγάλης βουλῆς in the list and we notice the absence of an author, unlike nearly all the remaining titles in the list to which are attributed the authors.

<sup>1</sup> ibid. p.494.

<sup>2</sup> Greg. Nyss. tres dii, 45, 129A (Migne).

<sup>3</sup> Dial. cxxviii, 4.

<sup>4</sup> Aster. Soph. fr. 18 ap. Eus. Marcell. i, 4 (Migne).

<sup>5</sup> Athanas. ep. Aeg. Lib. 12 (Migne).

<sup>6</sup> Constant. Ep. (ed. Opitz) 3, p.58, 4; cf. Greg. Nyss. con. Eunom. 8 (ob.394) (Migne); Athanas. adv. Arian. 3, 63 (ed. Bright).

<sup>7</sup> Dial. cxxvi, 1.



That in this reference Justin sees Christ as an angel is clear enough. He has as clear a reference elsewhere in the Dialogue:  
 ἄγγελος καλεῖται διὰ τὸ ἀγγέλειν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις  
 ὅσα πρὸς βούλεται αὐτοῖς ἀγγεῖλαι ἑ τῶν ἑλὼν ποιητῆς .<sup>1</sup>  
 Justin makes the same claim when he discusses the two great  
 commandments whereby man is enjoined to love God and to love his  
 neighbour. 'For the man who loves God with all the heart ... will  
 reverence no other God; καὶ ἄγγελον ἑκείνου ἂν τιμήβει  
 Θεοῦ βουλομένου κτλ'.<sup>2</sup> This gives further evidence of the strong link  
 in Justin's mind between the angel of Christ and God's Will. That  
 Justin had in mind a developed angelomorphic concept of the Christ-  
 Logos will be furthered discussed below.<sup>3</sup>

The phrase ἄγγελος μεγάλης βουλῆς appears only  
 once in the O.T. at Isaiah, ix,6. But its presence or absence needs a  
 brief comment. It occurs only in the Codex Vaticanus.<sup>4</sup> This codex  
 forms the basis of the manual edition of the LXX of H.B. Swete and  
 (to a lesser extent as the enterprise developed) the Larger Cambridge  
 edition of the LXX. It was also used as a principal source for the  
 manual edition of A. Rahlfs. But the apparatus criticus at Isaiah, ix,6  
 shows the absence of the expression in other manuscripts and it is even  
 absent from the text of the Codex Alexandrinus.<sup>5</sup> This is evidence that  
 some translators of the Hebrew text were not merely interested in  
 'angels', but showed a bias in introducing them into the LXX text.

Some of these introductions are not difficult to find. At  
Deut. xxxii,8, the R.S.V. reads 'he fixed the bounds of the peoples  
 according to the number of the sons of God' (  $\chi \gamma \psi \delta$  ) where  
 the LXX reads ἀγγέλων Θεοῦ . At Deut. xxxiii,2 the R.S.V. reads

<sup>1</sup> Dial. lvi,4.

<sup>2</sup> Dial. xciii,2.

<sup>3</sup> See p. 102.

<sup>4</sup> The sigla for this uncial codex are R. Holmes and J. Parsons =  
 II, P.A. de Lagarde = B.

<sup>5</sup> The sigla are Holmes and Parsons = III, Lagarde = A.

'with flaming fire at his right hand' where the LXX reads <sup>ἔξ</sup>  
 δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ ἄγγελοι μετ' αὐτοῦ . At Psalm, viii, 5 the R.S.V.  
 reads 'thou hast made him little less than God' where the LXX has  
 ἡλάττωσας αὐτὸν βραχύ τι παρ' ἁγγέλους .<sup>1</sup> It  
 seems very unlikely that the sole source for Justin of the expression  
 'angel of great will' was the doubtful reading of Isaiah, ix, 6 in a  
 unique manuscript verse. It therefore is all the more noteworthy that  
 in the paragraph of the Dialogue which we are discussing,<sup>2</sup> the O.T.  
 author of the name as it appears in the catalogue of names for Christ  
 is not given to us by Justin although he gives us the source and author  
 of most of the other names in the catalogue. Justin had stronger grounds  
 for giving this title to Christ.

According to Justin, Christ is the Angel who reveals the Will of  
 God. This is an unambiguously Gnostic motif. In later authors, we can  
 find similar references and the best explanation of this angelomorphic  
 christology is that it was prominent in Gnosticism. Biblical parallels,  
 it is agreed, are not hard to find. For example, God sorrowed over His  
 afflicted people and He joins with 'the angel of His presence'.<sup>3</sup> The  
 Angel of God is frequently encountered in the O.T.<sup>4</sup> The shepherd of  
 Hermas refers often to the exalted Lord as 'the glorious angel', the  
 'most venerable angel', the 'holy angel' and 'the angel of the Lord';  
 this figure is distinguishable from the other angels whose mission is  
 to direct Hermas<sup>5</sup> and it is from the date of The Shepherd onwards that  
 we begin to find closer and more frequent parallels to the term used by  
 Justin. But 'the Angel of the presence' and its variants are not quite  
 the same as 'angel of the great Will'.

<sup>1</sup> But cf. the A.V. 'Thou madest him a little lower than the angels'.

<sup>2</sup> Dial. cxxvi, 1.

<sup>3</sup> Isaiah, lxiii, 9.

<sup>4</sup> e.g. Gen. xxi, 17; xxxi, 11; Exod. xiv, 19; Judges vi, 20; xiii, 6, 9.

<sup>5</sup> Hermas, Vis. v, 2; Mand. v, 1, 7; Sim. v, iv, 4; vii, 1-3, 5; viii, 1, 1-2;  
 ix, 1, 3; ix, 12, 7-8.



Tertullian records that the Ebionites say that an angel was in Christ.<sup>1</sup> Ephiphanius informs us that the Ebionites say that Christ was created as one of the archangels.<sup>2</sup> Elsewhere, Christ governs as the greatest of the archangels.<sup>3</sup> Origen approaches a point where he all but identifies the two seraphs of Isaiah, vi,3 as Christ and the Holy Spirit.<sup>4</sup> The Gospel of Thomas makes it very clear that there existed an appreciation of the figure of Jesus as an angel: Simon Peter said to Him, 'You are like a righteous angel'.<sup>5</sup> In Valentinianism, Christ and the Holy Spirit were aeons.<sup>6</sup>

Justin was familiar enough with the Gnostics.<sup>7</sup> Irenaeus has given us a full account of the Barbelo-Gnostic doctrines of emissions.<sup>8</sup> The ineffable Father revealed himself to Barbelo and Light was born. The Father anointed the Light which was Christ. Eternal Life was joined with Will and these emanations magnified the Light. Will and Eternal Life emitted Grace, Willing, Intelligence and Thinking. Will is frequently mentioned as an emission in the Apocryphon of John.<sup>9</sup> The Gospel of Truth provides a closer parallel with the Will of God as described by Justin.<sup>10</sup> The author of the gospel refers to the words of God's meditation each of which is the work of His unique Will, in the revelation of His Word. The author goes on to refer to the beginning of things when the Logos was the first to come forth at the moment pleasing to the Will of Him who willed. 'But the Will is that in which the Father rests and which pleases Him. Nothing comes to pass without Him, nor does anything occur without the Will of the Father. But incomprehensible is His Will'.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Tertull. de Carn. Christ xiv (Migne).

<sup>2</sup> Epiph. Haer. xxx,16, (Migne).

<sup>3</sup> Clem. Hom. 18,4 (Migne); Clem. Recog. 2,42 (Migne).

<sup>4</sup> Origen, Princ. I,3,4 (ed. Koetschau).

<sup>5</sup> Gospel of Thomas, Log.13 (ed. Guillaumont et al.), 82,32 p.9.

<sup>6</sup> Iren. adv. Haer. I,2,5 Hippol. Refut vi,31 (Migne).

<sup>7</sup> e.g. I Apol. i,26.

<sup>8</sup> Iren. adv. Haer. I,29,1 (ed. Harvey).

<sup>9</sup> R.M. Grant, Gnosticism: an Anthology, pp.69-85 passim.

<sup>10</sup> E. Hennecke, (Eng. Trans.) N.T. Apocrypha, I, p.529.

<sup>11</sup> ibid.

There is sufficient evidence here to demonstrate that when Justin used a name-terminology like 'the angel of great Will', not found in the biblical authors, he was moving in Gnostic ideas. We have noted the gnostic usages that identified Christ as an Angel and we have seen how the concept of Will was also part of Gnostic terminology. Several references to this 'Angel of the Will' occur in Gnostic literature.<sup>1</sup> This Angel surpassed other angels as we see in the Gospel of Peter. The head of the first two (the angels who support Christ in His ascension) touched the sky; but the head of Him whom they were escorting reached above the sky.<sup>2</sup> The Elkesaites exaggerated the Angel's stature even further.<sup>3</sup> We have seen above that there was a good deal of evidence to lead to a conclusion that the anthropomorphic appearances of God in the O.T. were thought by Justin to be appearances of the Logos i.e. that the O.T. God was not the Supreme Unmoved Mover.<sup>4</sup> In the system of Basilides, according to Irenaeus, this O.T. God was an angel.<sup>5</sup> Irenaeus refutes the belief that the world was created by angels.<sup>6</sup>

There was the closest connection between the generation of the Son and the Will of the Father. Ignatius tells us of the Son begotten  $\text{ὁ ἰὸν θεοῦ κατὰ θέλημα καὶ δύναμιν}$ .<sup>7</sup> Tatian records  $\text{ἐκ θέληματι δὲ τῆς ἀπλότητος αὐτοῦ προπηδᾷ λόγος}$ .<sup>8</sup> Origen expresses the same thought.<sup>9</sup> The Son was believed to be this Will of the Father<sup>10</sup> and Hippolytus repeats this opinion.<sup>11</sup> Athanasius finds

<sup>1</sup> e.g. Clem. Excerpt. ex Theod. 43,2 (Migne).

<sup>2</sup> Keryg. Petr. 41 (trans. M.R. James).

<sup>3</sup> Hippol. Refut. ix,13,2 (Migne).

<sup>4</sup> See p.32.

<sup>5</sup> Iren. adv. Haer. I,24,3

<sup>6</sup> ibid. II,2,1; II,2,3.

<sup>7</sup> Ignat. ad Smyrn. I,1.

<sup>8</sup> Tat. Orat. 5.

<sup>9</sup> Origen, Princip. iv,4,1 (ed. Koetschau).

<sup>10</sup> Clem. Strom. v,1,18 (Migne).

<sup>11</sup> Hippol. Noet. 13 (Migne).



the paradox too great and refutes the Arian view: πῶς οὖν δύναται, βουλή καὶ θέλημα τοῦ πατρὸς ὑπάρχων, ὁ λόγος γίνεσθαι καὶ αὐτὸς θελήματι καὶ βουλήσει;<sup>1</sup> But Justin as we have seen was quite certain that the Son was begotten by the Will of the Father.<sup>2</sup>

Whatever interpretation is put upon the Hermetic literature, it abounds in references to the fact that creation occurred by the Will of God. In the beginning, for example, the connecting bond of all things was loosed by the Will of God.<sup>3</sup> It was by His own Will that the Creator fashioned the Entities.<sup>4</sup> It was the Will of The Invisible God Himself which created all things.<sup>5</sup> We find too that the World (which has its proper sense and understanding not like to the human) is the Will of The God. God is Father of the World and the World indeed is the Son of the God.<sup>6</sup> The δύναμις too of God is the Will.<sup>7</sup> Since this work dates to the latter part of the first century and the beginning of the second, we can easily see the influence which these writings had on the concept of the Will of God especially when joined to the concept of an Angel.

Very little has been derived from our study of God the Father in his relationship with the Logos—Christ the Son to lead us into a position from which we can subscribe to a belief that the God of Justin was the warm, loving Father of traditional Christian doctrine. The theophanies in the O.T. were not of God, but of the Logos. Justin used hypsistos of the O.T. God with care and caution and never in such a way as to detract from his view of a supreme, alone, unreachable and supra-mundane God. He urged Trypho not to locate God in a near, spatial sense, but as a God transcendent. The moral law of God demanded obedience, but Justin displayed little insight into the nature of sin. He conveyed

<sup>1</sup> Athan. adv. Arian. iii, 64 (Bright).

<sup>2</sup> Dial. lxi, 1.

<sup>3</sup> Corp. Herm. I, I, 18 (edd. Nock and Festugière).

<sup>4</sup> ibid. I, iv, 1.

<sup>5</sup> ibid. I, v, 7.

<sup>6</sup> ibid. I, ix, 8.

<sup>7</sup> ibid. I, x, 2.

to us little sense of a close relationship between God and His Son or between God and His creatures. He had little concept of God's saving grace. God was the Supreme Principle taken straight from the philosophical schools and he did not share in the biblical and Christian concept of God as a living, loving Creator, compassionate and long-suffering. Here was the God of Middle Platonism. It is not surprising that although he accepted belief in the resurrection of the natural body, his belief really lay in the immortality of the soul. Where Justin held to a view of God's goodness, he shared this with the Middle Platonists. He had a harsh belief in God as a judge. Salvation involved a retributive system of reward and punishment and was in its essentials little different from that of higher paganism.

Justin did not seem to know of the God who sent His only beloved Son into the world to redeem it. Christians for our author needed only a knowledge of God and His requirements. Where God was not the cosmic being of Middle Platonism, He is not unlike some of the Anatolian deities in the shape of Dolichenus or Jupiter Heliopolitanus. No evidence was presented that there was a warmth of a filial relationship between God and His Son and no response came to tormented mankind from a caring, loving God. There was absolutely no evidence that we are all sons by adoption.

Where Justin used the term Father, he used it in the sense of the Middle Platonists and restricted it to His role in creation. The Father was a transcendent Principle. Justin was placed therefore in an inescapable dilemma. How could God be completely transcendent and yet occupy His own, spatial location in heaven? He came down on the side of spatial location and placed himself among the Gnostics. We felt that there were strong Gnostic elements in his view of God as the Father of the All. Admittedly, Justin wished to personalize the Supreme Principle of the Unmoved Mover and this he did to some extent by employing the term 'The Begetter' of God, thereby making Him more than a cosmic cause. But throughout his works, he has recourse to apophatic terminology. When Justin used the term 'Will of God', he showed how subordinationist he was, especially when he allied the Christ-Logos as 'the Angel of Great Will' to Gnostic ideas. Justin's God was Middle Platonist, Subordinationist and Gnostic rather than biblical, co-equal, loving and 'orthodox'.



The Son

Philosophy in the first century B.C. began to develop systems which were intuitionist and mystical, combining in several ways elements of Stoicism and Platonism. Posidonius of Apamea (130-46 B.C.) may be considered as a major influence in this new tendency. Although he is known only from fragments and indirectly, it would appear that he made use of much Platonism in his borrowings. He laid emphasis on divine fiery breath as operative providence and considered this as transcendent.<sup>1</sup> The world possessed organic unity and a universal sympathy which bound all things together.<sup>2</sup> Man was situated in an intermediate place (ἐν μετεσφαιρίῳ) between the animal and the divine, between the principles of higher and lower orders.<sup>3</sup>

The doctrine of immortality was promulgated whereby the souls of the virtuous returned to the upper planes of the universe from where they had originated. There they existed through eternity contemplating Divine Reason. At this time too during the first century B.C. Platonic Ideas became identified with the immanent wisdom of the Divine Fire-Reason working as Providence in the upper parts of the universe. These ideas form an essential element of a common world-view of the century before Christ was born.<sup>4</sup> Many of these ideas formed the common-places of the later Gnostic systems.

The essence of these developments was the conviction that the world of matter and the abstraction of being were joined by patterns of intermediate entities through which various forces worked in interacting influences. These forces were often comprehended as a unity or as the expressions of the divine mind. They were described as Logos. Sometimes this was accessible to mortal minds either by logical thought or by intuition; at other times, this was the subject of rationalizing into legends or myths. Both the book of Genesis<sup>5</sup> and the

<sup>1</sup> A.H. Armstrong, An Introduction to Ancient Philosophy, pp.143-144. Commenta Lucani ad v.578 (ed. Usener, p.305).

<sup>2</sup> Cleomedes (150-200 A.D.), de motu circ. I,i,4,p.8 (ed. Ziegler).

<sup>3</sup> Nemesius (cir.350-400 A.D.), de nat. hom.I (= Migne,xl,505B-507A).

<sup>4</sup> A.H. Armstrong, An Introduction to Ancient Philosophy, p.144.

<sup>5</sup> Pseudo-Clementines,16,3ff. (Eng.trans. E. Hennecke, N.T. Apocrypha, II, p.545).

Timaeus of Plato<sup>1</sup> were susceptible to this kind of speculation. The necessary conclusion is that there were wide areas of intuitive philosophy which interacted with imaginative speculation.

It becomes very difficult to distinguish between Middle Platonism and Gnosticism. On the one hand there are examples of the most extravagant flights of Gnostic fancy such as among the Sethian-Ophites. These are completely different from the logia in the Gospel of Thomas, notwithstanding the Gnosticism of the author. Elements of Philo's speculation,<sup>2</sup> a good deal of St. John's Gospel (especially the prologue) and large sections of the Hermetica<sup>3</sup> seem to demonstrate that Platonism and thorough-going Gnosticism were not poles apart. Clement of Alexandria arrogated to the true Christian the name 'Gnostic'.<sup>4</sup> We have seen above that there were fringe areas in Justin's thinking which were tinged with Gnosticism. Such were the possibilities in the expression  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\ \tau\eta\nu\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma\ \beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\acute{\eta}\nu$ . We might even find in this novel claim why Tatian, the pupil of Justin, became a Gnostic. Was Middle Platonism therefore the 'respectable' side (as far as the philosophical schools were concerned) of Gnosticism? Or was Gnosticism the darker and more mystico-magical side, the more unenlightened and less rational thinking of speculative philosophy? There has been a good deal of evidence in Justin to think that this was so.

If this conclusion has a sound basis, one ought to find evidence in Justin for a Descent of the Redeemer, a typically Gnostic theme, where the bearer of gnosis is a messenger from the world of light who penetrates the barriers of the spheres, outwits the Archons, awakens the spirit from its earthy slumber and imparts to it the saving knowledge from without.<sup>5</sup> We ought to be able to find in Justin some thought of the Logos-Christ and His incarnation described in terms of a katabasis and anabasis. We shall be disappointed in that the word  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma$  does not appear to be used of the Logos-Christ by Justin.

<sup>1</sup> e.g. Tim. 41 D ff.

<sup>2</sup> e.g. Philo, Spec. Leg. i,13; de Somn. i,75; cf. C.H. Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, pp.54-73.

<sup>3</sup> e.g. Corp. Herm. I,I,8-9 (edd. Nock and Festugière); cf. Plato, Tim. 28.

<sup>4</sup> See Clem. Strom. vii, passim.

<sup>5</sup> H. Jonas, The Gnostic Religion, p.45.



Our author specifically denies that the word applies to God:  
 μὴ ἡγεῖσθε αὐτὸν τὸν ἀγέννητον Θεὸν  
 καταβεβηκέναι ἢ ἀναβεβηκέναι πούθεν .<sup>1</sup> Yet  
 Justin has several references to the anabatic Christ: e.g. ἐπειδὴ  
 ἐγνώκατε αὐτὸν ἀναστάντα ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ ἀναβάντα  
 εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν .<sup>2</sup> He varies the term ἀναβαίνω with other  
 compounds e.g. ἀνελεῖσθαι ,<sup>3</sup> ἀνάγω ,<sup>4</sup> ἀνέφερα ,<sup>5</sup>  
 ἀναλαβάνω ,<sup>6</sup> ἄνυσθαι .<sup>7</sup>

Justin is not evading the issue of pre-existence of the Logos  
 about which he is specific.<sup>8</sup> But he appears to be edging away from  
 'the Descent of the Redeemer' theme as it was specifically and  
 prominently defined by gnostics. R.L. Longenecker believes that this  
 theme reflected an earlier Christian tradition which did not originate  
 in Pauline writings, but preceded them.<sup>9</sup> Longenecker discusses the  
 commonly quoted N.T. references<sup>10</sup> before noting some plausible  
 prototypes for certain elements of the N.T. motifs.<sup>11</sup> His discussion  
 of I Enoch caps. 12-16 points to the fact that Enoch was sent to the  
 Watchers who implore him to make a petition to God for their  
 forgiveness. Enoch is then lifted up to heaven to the courts of the  
 Lord. Longenecker understands the sending of Enoch as being either a  
descensus ad inferos, or a penetration into the transcendental sphere  
 of spirits, or an Incarnation or a Pentecost. He admits that the former  
 two interpretations make more sense than the latter two.

<sup>1</sup> Dial. cxxvii,1.

<sup>2</sup> Dial. xvii,1; cf. xxxix,5; lxxv,2; cxxvi,1.

<sup>3</sup> I Apol. xxvi,1; Dial. xxxix,4; lxxvii,6.

<sup>4</sup> Dial. xxxii,3.

<sup>5</sup> Dial. xxxiv,2; lxiv,7; lxxv,1; cviii,2; cxxxii,1.

<sup>6</sup> Dial. xxxii,3.

<sup>7</sup> Dial. lxxxi,1.

<sup>8</sup> e.g. Dial. lxxvii,2.

<sup>9</sup> R.N. Longenecker, The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity, p.60.

<sup>10</sup> ibid. pp.61-62.

<sup>11</sup> ibid.

Although one would be bold to cross disputatious swords with Longenecker, there seems a paucity of evidence in this section of I Enoch to establish 'a descent of a Redeemer' theme on the basis of Enoch's movements. Enoch is still on earth, although he has withdrawn from the circle of men. He is certainly not translated. He 'was hidden from the children of men'. The Greek version designated Gg<sup>1</sup> reads 'was taken'. Neither reading indicates 'a descent'. Longenecker further claims that the theme  $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma - \acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma$  was prominent in Jewish Christianity of the second and third centuries A.D. As evidence he is content to cite Jean Daniélou.<sup>2</sup> But a study of the sources in Daniélou reveals little evidence since the French author seeks to establish a case that one of the first characteristics of Jewish Christian Christology was that the mystery of the descent of the Son was hidden from the angels. This may well be. But Longenecker is using the same source material to establish that the theme of 'the descent of a Redeemer' was known in pre-Pauline Christian tradition among biblical motifs. Longenecker must fail in his claim since none of the sources of Daniélou is pre-Pauline. Daniélou's sources are to a large extent gnostic in origin. Longenecker selects as a representative passage the Gospel of Peter 10,41f. But this passage is an unmistakable reference to a descensus ad inferos.<sup>3</sup> In our own study, a source for a descensus ad inferos is irrelevant since we are searching for a source for a katabatic Logos-Christ who was incarnate on earth. Longenecker makes a final point that a katabasis-anabasis Christology appears prominently in Jewish canonical materials and that where it appears in Paul, it is with the suggestion of its pre-Pauline character.

<sup>1</sup> Caps. i-xxxii,6 and xix,3-xxi,9 were discovered as Greek versions in 1886-87 at Akhmim in Egypt by the Mission Archeologique Francaise at Cairo and published by M. Bouriant in 1892, Fragments grecs du livre d'Enoch. Mémoires publiées par les membres de la mission archeologique francaise au Caire, tom. ix, pp.91-136 (1892).

<sup>2</sup> J. Daniélou, Theology of Jewish Christianity, pp.205-63.

<sup>3</sup> Gospel of Peter, 10,41-42: 'And they heard a voice out of the heavens crying, "Thou hast preached to them that sleep", (cf. I Peter, iii,19) and from the cross there was heard the answer, "Yea".' E. Hennecke, Eng. Trans.) N.T. Apocrypha, I, p.186.



Longenecker sums up his evidence with the claim that there is an ambivalence which defies precise designation of the descent involved. This is a fortunate restraint which he places on his argument since the Jewish Christian canonical materials which he uses viz. Phil. ii, 6-11; John, i, 1-18; iii, 13; vi, 62; Heb. ii, 5 and probably Eph. iv, 8-10, certainly describe 'the humiliation of incarnation' theme, but not 'the descent of a redeemer' figure, except where this is linked very firmly to 'the Son of Man' idea (John, iii, 13). Such commentators as Longenecker give little help in the search for a katabatic Christ-Logos theme in Justin and we must confess to disappointment in our enquiry. But he is familiar with an anabatic Christ-Logos as we have noted above.<sup>1</sup>

Bultmann understands that the Gnostic stock of concepts served to clarify the Redeemer as a cosmic figure, the pre-existent divine being, Son of the Father, who came down from heaven and assumed human form and who, after his activity on earth, was exalted to heavenly glory.<sup>2</sup> This pre-Christian redeemer myth is ascribed to Iranian origins and is not directly demonstrable in pre-Christian sources. Much of its credence is owed to the literary fragments of Mandeism (dated to the 7th or 8th centuries A.D.) and the even later Manichean literature. It is suggested that the myth occurs in the Christian gnostic systems attacked by the church Fathers, and in the gnostic literature such as Pistis Sophia, the Odes of Solomon, the Acts of Thomas and the Hermetic literature. It is claimed to be the sub-stratum of the Pauline christology, the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Johannine parts of the N.T. It can be seen, it is said, in parts of Philo and much of the hokhma-sophia ideas in Hellenistic Judaism.<sup>3</sup> This hypothesis has not won unqualified acceptance and is keenly disputed by many scholars.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See p. 79.

<sup>2</sup> R. Bultmann, Theology of the N.T., I, 175ff.

<sup>3</sup> R.H. Fuller, The Foundations of N.T. Christology, 93ff.

<sup>4</sup> See for example, M. Hengel, Son of God, passim; R.Mcl. Wilson, Gnosis and the New Testament, p.28.

We cannot pursue our enquiries into the ultimate origin of the idea of a redeemer myth, whether Iranian or not. It is sufficient for our present investigation to acknowledge that the figure of the Gnostic redeemer who descended and ascended was of considerable influence in primitive Christologies.

We have noted that Justin avoids a description of Christ as katabatic. He uses the precise term anabatic infrequently and prefers to use a variety of terms, different in verbal form, but having much the same significance.<sup>1</sup> Justin considered 'a descent' as Gnostic. A 'descent' was not essential to incarnation; a descending Christ was not to be preferred to the Christ who took flesh and was born. A descent, for Justin, could have unequivocal Gnostic associations and parallels; an ascent theme without a previous descent need not be so linked.

Justin does not dodge the issue of the manner in which the Logos-Christ became incarnate. Whenever he needs to refer to this (and he does do often), he uses the vocabulary of current Middle Platonism. 'Jesus the Christ is the Son of God and His Apostle, being πρότερον Word ... but now having become man ( ἄνθρωπος γινόμενος ).'<sup>2</sup> γινόμενος is a fundamental term in Platonism and is descriptive of that which has no real existence compared with τὸ ὄν. Plutarch sums this contrast up: ἡμῖν μὲν γὰρ ὄντως τοῦ εἶναι μέτεστιν οὐδέν, ἀλλὰ πάντα θνητῇ φύσει ἐν μέσῳ γενέσεως καὶ φθορᾶς γινόμενῃ.<sup>3</sup> The contrast between 'Being' and 'Becoming' draws on the world-view elaborated by Plato's theory of Ideas. 'Becoming' describes the tangible, visible world apparent to the senses. It is an inferior existence making up the material in physical nature. This lower order consists of a world whose fundamental law is that of change. The higher reality of Being is incomprehensible to the senses. The Incarnation for Justin was the entry of the pre-existent Logos-Christ from the world of Being to that of Becoming. Justin describes our Lord Jesus Christ:

<sup>1</sup>See p.79.

<sup>2</sup>I Apol. lxiii,10; Dial. lli,3; lxxvi,1; ci,1; γένεσις lxxxviii,8 cf. Dial. lxxxviii,8: τότε γενεσιν αὐτοῦ λέγων.

<sup>3</sup>Plut. de E apud Delph. 392A (Loeb).



ἔσαν μέλλῃ ἐν δόξῃ ἐξ οὐρανῶν παραγίνεσθαι.<sup>1</sup>

Justin distinguishes between entry into the world of Becoming and being born: οὐκ ἂν ἐβλαβόμεναι εἰς αὐτὸν ἤδη

καὶ παραγενόμενον καὶ γεννηθέντα.<sup>2</sup> Justin applies a further

Middle Platonist term to the Logos-Christ when ὥπερ ... τῇ πρώτῃ παρουσίᾳ ἡμεῖς ἔφανεν<sup>3</sup> since φαίνεσθαι designates that which appears to the senses<sup>4</sup> or of what is mentally manifest.<sup>5</sup>

Justin employs προέρχεσθαι as a further word descriptive of the Logos-Christ's incarnation: ὅτις ... τῷ παντὶ κόσμῳ ἐκ ἡρώδετος προελευόμενος<sup>6</sup> and with a recognition of the katabatic Redeemer: ἀναμνησθέντες ἵνα καὶ θεὸν ἀναθὲν προελθόντα ... γνωρίσωμεν.<sup>7</sup> And in a further reference: υἱὸν ... νενοήκαμεν ὅντα καὶ τῶ πάντων ποιημάτων ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς δυνάμει αὐτοῦ καὶ βουλῇ προελθόντα.<sup>8</sup> The classical meaning of the word was 'to step forward' to speak, 'to step out' and thereby to be recognized as having come forward. The word had no special philosophical connotation. But it was seized on by the Fathers as 'to come forth, proceed'. Ignatius uses it of Christ's proceeding from the Father: Χριστὸν τὸν ἀφ' ἑνὸς πατρὸς προελθόντα.<sup>9</sup> Tatian employs the word too: λόγος προελθὼν ἐκ τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς δυνάμεως.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Dial. xlix,3; in this passage, Justin uses παραγίνεσθαι to designate the translation from Being to Becoming even at the Parousia.

<sup>2</sup> ibid. cxxvi,1.

<sup>3</sup> ibid. xlix,7.

<sup>4</sup> e.g. Aristot. Cael. 303 a 22 et al (ed. Bekker).

<sup>5</sup> id. Eth. Nic. 1175 a 29.

<sup>6</sup> Dial. xliii,1.

<sup>7</sup> ibid. lxiv,7.

<sup>8</sup> ibid. c,4.

<sup>9</sup> Ign. Magn. vii,2.

<sup>10</sup> Tat. Orat. 5.

But Justin uses a further word which while avoiding the gnostic connotation of καταβαίνειν, underlines his subordinationist view of Christ. God according to Justin sends His Son into the world: τὸν πέμψαντα αὐτὸν παντοκράτορα... ἀθετεῖτε.<sup>1</sup> If Christ was sent and acted because God willed this, we need not be surprised when Justin uses a further word which indicates that Christ, if he was not a Gnostic emanation, was nevertheless at least an emissary: αὐτὸς γάρ... ἀποτέλλεται μηνύων ἕκαστὸν ἀγγελλέται.<sup>2</sup> The N.T. tone of this is evident.<sup>3</sup> The Clementine Homilies link the sending of the Son with the will of the Father: οὗτος... τῆν τοῦ ἀποτέλλαντος πατρὸς βούλησιν ἐκφαίνων.<sup>4</sup> The anonymous author of the Letter to Diognetus makes the same point about the Logos: ἀπέστειλε λόγον, ἵνα κόσμῳ φανῇ.<sup>5</sup> If the Logos-Christ was sent by the Father, Justin demonstrated that Docetism was not acceptable as an explanation of the Son's relationship to the Father. The nuance was not missed in later Sabellian controversy. Eusebius refers to this heresy: αὐτὸς ἔστιν ὁ... ἀπεστάλαξαι λέγων ὑφ' ἑαυτοῦ.<sup>6</sup> But Theodorus of Mopsuesta believed that this sending of the Son was not at all an undermining of the belief in the economic unity of the Godhead: εἶπεν... γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικὸς ἀπέστειλεν, ὥς εἶναι δῆλον, ὅτι τῇ ἐνανθρωπήσει πρόκειται τὸ τῆς ἀπεσταλῆς ὄνομα.<sup>7</sup> Justin was not involved in these later patripassian controversies; but his concern to avoid the gnostic doctrines of the descent of a redeemer as an emanation of the Unknowable God is underlined by his avoidance of katabatic references and a hint here and there of subordinationist leanings.

<sup>1</sup> Dial. xvi,4; vid. Dial. xvii,3; cxxvi,6; cf. cxxvii,3; cxxxvi,3.

<sup>2</sup> I Apol. lxiii,4.

<sup>3</sup> cf. Matt. x,40.

<sup>4</sup> Hom. Clem. i,7 (Migne).

<sup>5</sup> Diogn. xi,3.

<sup>6</sup> Euseb. de Eccles. Theol. ii,12 (Migne).

<sup>7</sup> Theodorus Mops. (ob.428 A.D.), Comm. in Heb. iii,2 (ed. Staab). There is an erratum at Lampe, Patr. Gr. Lex, s.v. ἀπετέλλω, II,A where the reference is wrongly ascribed to Theodoret.



It is time for us to enquire into the nature of the Logos who was sent by the will and power of the Father.<sup>1</sup> It will help us too if we confine our initial approach to an investigation of the term *λόγος ἐπεφηματικός*, a term favoured by Justin. Source material for this is confined to the two Apologies as far as the term is used by him. The epithet *ἐπεφηματικός* is absent from the LXX and it is not used by the writers of the N.T. In classical Greek, its usage seems late and is familiar both in a physical sense<sup>2</sup> and in a metaphysical sense.<sup>3</sup> It was a technical term in the Stoic schools and was employed in the sense of the general generative principle as we shall note below. Philo was quite familiar with the word. It does not appear in the Apostolic Fathers. We shall have occasion to note too the development of the term after Justin and the Apologists.

It was a commonplace opinion of the Apologists that the more enlightened pagans were familiar with some elements of truth. In his works, Justin explains that this has resulted from the fact that the seed of the Logos (*τὸ ἐπεφύατο τοῦ λόγου*) has resided in all individuals since their creation.<sup>4</sup> The philosophers among the Greeks borrowed from the O.T.<sup>5</sup> and devils also had a hand in distorting what was actually taken from Christian sources.<sup>6</sup> There is a seeming contradiction here which can be ignored for the time being.<sup>7</sup>

*ἐπεφηματικός* may be taken as definitive of an aspect of the Logos' totality.

<sup>1</sup> Dial. c,4.

<sup>2</sup> e.g. Aristot. de Gen. Anim. 716 b 17: *ἐπεφηματικὰ ὀφθαλμοί* ;  
Theophr. de Caus. Plant. 1,16,4: *ἐπεφηματικὸν ὄζον* (ed. Wimmer)  
See p. 92.

<sup>3</sup> See 93 ff.

<sup>4</sup> e.g. II Apol. vii(viii),1.

<sup>5</sup> e.g. I Apol. xliv,9.

<sup>6</sup> e.g. I Apol. v,3.

<sup>7</sup> This is exhaustively discussed by R. Holte, Studia Theologica, xii, fasc. II (1958), 163 ff.

Middle Platonists borrowed much of their thinking about the Logos from the Stoa. The Logos was defined in terms of λόγος ἐνδιδάκτερος and λόγος προφητικός. Originally employed to distinguish between the different functions of the Logos as thought and voice, they were later used in a metaphysical sense by Middle Platonists. Theophilus, for example, exemplifies the use of the terms as Logos endiathetos, the Logos innate or latent in the mind of God and Logos prophorikos as the Logos expressed or uttered from the mind of God.<sup>1</sup> This distinction is not made overtly in Justin. But in Dial. cxxviii,3 God, Justin says, causes His δύναμιν προπηδᾶν, καὶ ὅταν βούληται, πάλιν ἀνατέλλει εἰς ἑαυτόν.

Justin owed his concept not necessarily to any single tradition. The sources of second century A.D. thinking about the Logos drew on the Johannine pedigree, on Philonic exegesis and on current ideas in Middle Platonism. To what extent these are separate traditions is doubtful. What was Hellenist and what was Judaistic in John's prologue defies precise definition at the moment although the emphasis is currently being placed on Judaism as a sitz im leben. Philo is certainly a brilliant innovator; but his debt to Platonism is profound for all his claimed orthodoxy. To what extent too Stoicism was still independent of Middle Platonism is a difficult question. But it is evident that Justin's Logos was a development from the two traditions of Judaism and Greek philosophy.

The problems attached to any hypostatization of the Aramaic ܠܡܪܐ or the O.T. ַיְיָ especially the former in the popular Aramaic paraphrases and circumlocutions of the Targums, have been well defined. The use of Memra as the Word of God developed from the same theological traditionalism inherited by Justin and it is highly improbable in view of his erudite Biblical exegesis in the company of Trypho, that Justin was unaware of the connotations of Memra. The Targums were popular expositions of the O.T. for men who knew no Greek or Hebrew, but were sufficiently orthodox to reject the anthropomorphisms of the O.T. like 'the Lord God walked in the garden'. For these the Targums substituted the expressions which included Memra.<sup>2</sup> A tension certainly existed between

<sup>1</sup>Theoph. ad Autol. ii,10; ii,22: λόγος ἐνδιδάκτερος; ibid.; ii,22: λόγος & προφητικός; cf. ii,10.

<sup>2</sup>See Strack-Billerbeck, ii, pp.302-333.



Christian thinking about the Christ Logos and Jewish thinking about the Word of God as Origen pointed out.<sup>1</sup>

The close identity of the Word as God Himself acting as an anthropomorphized person is found often in post-canonical Jewish literature. As men thought they saw the Divinity working intensely in the daily round of the world's activities, the Word of the Lord began to grow progressively as a distinct element within the nature of the Godhead. The Word was regarded as a powerful extension of God's personality.<sup>2</sup> The self-manifestation of God tended to be represented as being mediated by an agent, personal rather than impersonal. The proof texts are well known.<sup>3</sup> This is not to claim that Hebrew belief invented a being who was an independent mediator between God and His creation. But later thought carried the tendency a long way. We see this in the concept of Sophia, for example, in much of the Wisdom literature.<sup>4</sup>

It was the influence of Hellenism which urged men to ask what was the differentiation of function or the exact relationship between Wisdom and God.<sup>5</sup> This tendency to hypostasis is most apparent in the Targums.  $\text{אֱלֹהִים בְּרֵאשִׁית}$  is increasingly used in connection with the name of God to express His active agency in creation.<sup>6</sup>  $\text{וְהָיָה הַדְּבָרִים}$  as is well known,<sup>7</sup> was subject to the same theological pressures. Judaism elevated Yahweh to a remote aloofness and then felt the need to bridge the gap.

<sup>1</sup> Origen, con. Cels. ii,31 (ed. Koetschau).

<sup>2</sup> L.W. Barnard, Justin Martyr, pp.85-100. He claims that this is a phenomenon of translation. He seems to follow G.F. Moore, Judaism, I, p.419.

<sup>3</sup> e.g. Gen. xviii,1; xxi,17; xxxi,11,13. The entire subject is a topic for conflicting opinion in detail, but the thesis is acceptable.

<sup>4</sup> e.g. Wisdom, vii,22-30. The writer takes his definitions from Stoic ideas. There are few parallels to rival the philosophical statements in IV Maccabees, i,16 (LXX) concerning the current views of sophia as an ideal.

<sup>5</sup> The question remains unanswered. The best statement is still that of J. Drummond, Philo Judaeus, ii,201 ff.

<sup>6</sup> e.g. A. Sperber, The Bible in Aramaic, i, p.4, Gen. iii,8; cf. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Levi, xviii, 5; (ed. Charles) cf. Ecclus. xxxiii,3 where the Hebrew text  $\text{וְהָיָה הַדְּבָרִים}$  gives 'A man of discernment discerns the Word' where the Greek version hedges with  $\text{ἐνπιότρετοι λόγῳ}$  (λόγος =  $\text{וְהָיָה}$  cf. Psalms, cxix,57,105).

<sup>7</sup> e.g. A. Sperber, loc. cit. i, p.131, Exod. xxv,8.

Philo had to say: 'we are able to state of God only that He is, not what He is'. God was ἄπαιτος ; no name could be given to Him (ἀφηγῆτος); all He is attributed with, is the fact that He is ὁ ὢν . Philo wished to be thought an orthodox Jew. The Shekinah was a help to the Jews in bridging the gap between the remoteness of Yahweh and His creation. The uttered Word of God was a necessity for the same purpose.

Λόγος was an idea used by the Stoics to express that καθ' ὃν ὁ κόσμος διεξάγεται<sup>1</sup> As a result it was a synonym for Θεός<sup>2</sup> and the Stoic Chrysippus identified εἰμαρμένη with ὁ Διὸς λόγος .<sup>3</sup> God is ὁ πάντων τῶν ὄντων λόγος .<sup>4</sup> Logos is the principle actively engaged in forming the universe, not only by creating it, but also in giving it shape. By the Stoics, Logos, like every other thing, was considered to be material. The world itself was a gradual revelation of the fullness of Logos,<sup>5</sup> sometimes called πῦρ , sometimes πνεῦμα . But Zeno refers to λόγος σπερματικός as the living power which gives shape to unformed matter and causes plants and animals to grow and move.<sup>6</sup>

Unlike the Stoics, Plato differentiated between three elements in his system of metaphysics; these were matter, ideas and the Supreme Good or God. Owing much in addition to Aristotle's concept of the ἀκίνητος Νεὸς , the Middle Platonists reinterpreted Plato and incorporated elements of Stoic thinking into their systems. We must be careful not to interpret a Middle Platonist 'school' too narrowly. But the Supreme God is now distinct and remote.<sup>7</sup> The cosmos which God has created,<sup>8</sup> has not been abandoned and does not lack divine surveillance.

<sup>1</sup> Diog. Laert. vii,149 (Loeb).

<sup>2</sup> id. vii,136; cf. Zeno in Diog. Laert. vii,134 (Loeb).

<sup>3</sup> Plut. Stoic. Repugn. 47 = Stoic. Vet. Frag. II,937,39; cf. Diog. Laert. vii,135-136 (Loeb).

<sup>4</sup> Orig. con. Cels. v,14 (ed. Koetschau).

<sup>5</sup> e.g. Diog. Laert. vii,56: πᾶν γὰρ το ποιοῦν εὐφρά ἐστι (Loeb).

<sup>6</sup> Diog. Laert. vii,136 (Loeb).

<sup>7</sup> cf. Phil. Leg. Alleg. II,2: ἀλλ' ἀπὸ γῆς ἀλλω.

<sup>8</sup> Albinus, Didask. x,3 (ed. Hermann).



God has entrusted others with its management and they exercise this function at one with the Father's will.<sup>1</sup> These are sons of the Father and man is in communication with these through the medium of dreams and oracles.<sup>2</sup> Maximus of Tyre outlines these ideas in his system, stating that there is a fair measure of agreement that there is one supreme God and many subordinate Gods: ὅτι θεὸς εἰς πάντων βασιλεὺς καὶ πατήρ, καὶ θεοὶ πολλοί, θεοῦ παῖδες, συνάρχοντες θεοῦ.<sup>3</sup> Nevertheless it is difficult to find among the Middle Platonists a system which completely explains the entire relationship between the Cosmos and the Supreme God.

Philo has his own unique place in the history of ideas as far as the development of the Logos concept is concerned. The Logos appears in his works frequently and there is no agreement among all scholars whether Philo owes his categories to Greek philosophy or to Jewish ideas.<sup>4</sup> The difficulty underlying the resolution of this question results from Philo's syncretism. Philo adds a dimension by using the terminology λόγος θεοῦ or θεῖος λόγος in a way not employed by the Hellenist philosophers. The Logos for Philo is therefore not synonymous with God as the Stoics claimed.<sup>5</sup> But if Logos is a God, he is in second place: τὸ δὲ γενικώτατον ἔστιν ὁ θεός, καὶ δεύτερος ὁ θεοῦ λόγος, τὰ δ' ἄλλα λόγῳ μόνον ὑπάρχει.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>e.g. ibid. xv,1-2; Apul. de Platone, I,12, (ed. Thomas); Max. Tyr. xi, 5a-b (ed. Hobein); ibid. xi, 12 a-e: καὶ κοινωνοὺς τῆς ἀρχῆς πολλοὺς μὲν ὁρατοὺς θεοὺς, πολλοὺς δὲ ἀφανεῖς; Plut, de defect. orac. x, 414F - 415C (Loeb Moralia, v, pp.376-381).

<sup>2</sup>Albinus, Didask. xv,1: τῶν ἄλλων δὲ ἐκείνου παῖδες ἡγοῦνται (ed. Hermann).

<sup>3</sup>Max. Tyr. xi, 5a-b (ed. Hobein).

<sup>4</sup>See Leisegang, Pauly-Wiss. 1077f.

<sup>5</sup>cf. Orig. con. Cels. v,24: ὁ τῶν πάντων λόγος ἔστι κατὰ μὲν κέλευν αὐτὸς ὁ θεός, κατὰ δὲ ἡμῶν εὐεὶς αὐτοῦ (ed. Koetschau).

<sup>6</sup>Phil. Leg. All. II 86.

Philo calls the Logos εἰκὼν .<sup>1</sup> All the things which God has created are like some flock under the hand of Himself as King and Shepherd. He has set over his flock τὸν ὀρθὸν ἀστέον λόγον καὶ πρωτόγονον υἱόν .<sup>2</sup> In Philo the Logos mediates as a bridge between the remote and transcending God and His creation. The universe of ideas would have no other place than in the divine Logos which made these things.<sup>3</sup> Philo can conceive of no other place for his συνάμειν .<sup>4</sup> There are two elements therefore in Philo which have a strong claim to being less than Greek; firstly his expression λόγος Θεοῦ and Θεῖος λόγος ; secondly his highly individual and personal nature of Logos.<sup>5</sup>

The problems attached to the origin and nature of Logos as it appears in the Johannine writings are equally complex. Formerly thought to have been formulated under the influence of Greek philosophy, the Johannine Logos is now thought to have its roots in Judaism.<sup>6</sup> Although St. John's gospel employs the word Logos in a variety of contexts e.g. ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ (John, x,35); ὁ λόγος ᾧ ᾤμινα = the words Jesus is uttering (John, vi,60; vii,40); ὁ λόγος ὁ σὸς = God's word (John, xvii,17), the usage of λόγος as an entity or hypostasis or projection is not found outside the prooemium to the Gospel (ignoring for a moment the appearance of the term in the first epistle of John).

The Logos in John's introduction has a pre-existence and this Logos is revealed in human history at a point in time. This revelation is considered to be the person of Jesus and the point of departure from the pre-existence of the Logos to the manifestation in the flesh is precisely described in καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο . It does

<sup>1</sup> Philo, Spec. Leg. I,81: λόγος δ' ἐστὶν εἰκὼν Θεοῦ, δι' οὗ κόσμος ὁ κόσμος ἐδημιουργεῖτο.

<sup>2</sup> id. de Agric. 51; cf. de Somn. I,215: ὁ πρωτόγονος αὐτοῦ Θεῖος λόγος.

<sup>3</sup> id. Op. Mund. 20.

<sup>4</sup> ibid; cf. Fug. 101; Rer. Div. Her. 188.

<sup>5</sup> e.g. id. Fug. 101.

<sup>6</sup> A.M. Hunter, According to John (1968), pp.9-17. He gives an excellent resumé of the development of scholarship on Johannine origins.



not appear to scholars working in this specialized field of Johannine origins that this particular concept of Logos can have developed without strain for Jewish teaching about the Messiah. Pre-existence was not a qualification attached to the O.T. Messiah.<sup>1</sup> But nevertheless, analogies might be found in four other traditions; the Hellenistic Gnostic Logos, the oriental Gnostic Man, the Hellenistic-Jewish  $\text{λογος} \mid \text{יהוה}$ , the Palestinian Jewish Torah.<sup>2</sup>

But of these traditions, Justin seems to have no knowledge. The Logos for him is pre-existent as Christ, the  $\text{πρωτότερος τοῦ θεοῦ}$ <sup>3</sup> and in Him  $\text{πάν γένος ἀνθρώπων μετέσχε}$ .<sup>4</sup> This Christ is Jesus Christ the Son of God and His Apostle, formerly Logos,  $\text{ἐν ἰδέᾳ πυρὸς, ποτὲ δὲ καὶ ἐν εἰκονὶ σώματος}$ .<sup>5</sup> The way in which Justin uses Hellenist vocabulary to refer to this theophany is a clear statement of his Stoic and Platonist antecedents. Our author returns to this when he says that Jesus Christ  $\text{καὶ πρότερον διὰ τῆς τοῦ πυρὸς μορφῆς καὶ εἰκόνος σώματος} \dots \text{ἔφανη}$ .<sup>6</sup> But Justin does not content himself with these Hellenist concepts. He goes further and takes up a position not unlike that taken by the writer of the prooemium to St. John's gospel. A revelation was given, he says, to those who were not even Greek  $\text{ὅτι αὐτοῦ τοῦ λόγου μορφωθέντος καὶ ἀνθρώπου γενομένου καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ κληθέντος}$ .<sup>7</sup> The Logos became Man by a virgin ... for the salvation of those who believe Him, He continued to be set at naught and to suffer, so that in dying and rising again, He might overcome death.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Strack-Bill. II, 333-352. Billerbeck has been unable to find any such qualifications in a thoroughly comprehensive study.

<sup>2</sup>Kittel, T.W.N.T. 5 v λέγω D 14 c.

<sup>3</sup>I Apol. xlvi, 2.

<sup>4</sup>ibid.

<sup>5</sup>ibid. lxiii, 10. Blunt reads  $\text{σώματος}$ . The references are to the appearance in the form of fire as the angel of God (Exod. iii, 6).

<sup>6</sup>I Apol. lxiii, 16.

<sup>7</sup>ibid. v, 4.

<sup>8</sup>ibid. lxiii, 16.

It is within this context that the Logos Spermatikos as a term used by Justin must be evaluated. Justin accepted the Middle Platonist idea of the Logos together with the belief that this Logos was no other than the pre-existent Christ who in the time of Pontius Pilate was born of a virgin as a man and was crucified. He died and rose again.<sup>1</sup> We noted above Zeno's reference to λόγος σπερματικός as the vital living power which gave shape to unformed matter and caused plants and animals to grow and move.<sup>2</sup> This would not have been an uncongenial idea to Justin. Certainly as far as true knowledge was concerned, whatever lawyers or philosophers uttered well, they elaborated through contemplation and discovery κατὰ λόγου μέρος.<sup>3</sup> The world in any case was created by God διὰ λόγου. For ὁ δὲ υἱὸς ἐκείνου, ὁ μόνος λεγόμενος κυρίως υἱός, ὁ λόγος πρὸ τῶν ποιημάτων καὶ δυνάων καὶ γεννώμενος, ὅτε τὴν ἀρχὴν δι' αὐτοῦ πάντα ἐκτίθε καὶ ἐκύβηθε.<sup>4</sup>

But in its first usage by the early Stoics, the term Logos Spermatikos was a biological concept employed in Physics, largely to explain the continuation of species from one generation to another. According to the Stoics, a centre is located in every organic thing and this is the source of the pneuma which flows out into the whole body of a plant or animal. As it flows out to the eyes, it emerges as a sense of light; hearing is the sense that results from pneuma flowing to the ears. It is the seminal fluid when it flows through the sexual organs. The male has one flow; the female another. When these two logoi spermatikoi combine, new life comes into existence.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>I Apol. xlv,5.

<sup>2</sup>See p. 88.

<sup>3</sup>II Apol. x,2.

<sup>4</sup>ibid. v(vi),3.

<sup>5</sup>Aetius, Plac. I,7,33 (= Stoic. Vet. Frag. II, 1027): τοὺς σπερματικούς λόγους, καθ' οὓς ἕκαστα καθ' εἰμαρμένην γίνονται.



Although this was at first a straightforward explanation of a physical phenomenon, the development of the concept became most complicated because it was used for exegesis through metaphor and simile in attempting to explain the origins of the cosmos. Diogenes used the idea to refer to God's activity.<sup>1</sup> These general ideas were certainly familiar to Athenagoras.<sup>2</sup> But although the concept of the Logos Spermatikos lacked precision as it was employed figuratively, it is not easy to find evidence that it ever lost completely its physical sense or that Stoics ever considered that it was a specific cosmological principle only.

But Justin did not use it in any biological way. But he did not raise it to a cosmological hypostasis or particular entity distinct from Logos either. He believed that in every man a seed of the Logos was implanted: διὰ τὸ ἐμφυτον παντὶ γένει ἀνθρώπων σπέρμα τοῦ λόγου.<sup>3</sup> The demons have always arranged it that all those who ever so little strove to live by Logos and to avoid evil, should be hated.<sup>4</sup> It is not astonishing that the devils are proved to cause those to be much worse hated who live not by a part only from the Logos Spermatikos, but by the knowledge and contemplation of the whole Logos, that is Christ.<sup>5</sup> In every man, Logos implants a part of Himself, a seed as it were, and when the Logos is considered as performing the function of imparting this part to man, He is considered to be Spermatikos. The Logos Spermatikos is not therefore a different principle from Logos.

<sup>1</sup> Diog. Laert. vii, 135 f: 'God is one and the same as Reason, Fate and Zeus καὶ ὥς περ ἐν τῇ γονῇ τὸ σπέρμα περιέχεται, οὕτω καὶ τοῦτον σπερματικὸν λόγον ὄντα τοῦ κόσμου, τοιούδ' ὑπολείπεσθαι ἐν τῷ ὑγρῷ κτλ (Loeb).

<sup>2</sup> e.g. Athenag. Leg. 6.

<sup>3</sup> II Apol. (vii)viii,1.

<sup>4</sup> ibid. (vii)viii,2.

<sup>5</sup> ibid. (vii)viii,3.

Christian teachings then appear to Justin to be greater than all human teaching because the entire Logos principle came into being as Christ in body, in reason, in soul.<sup>1</sup> For whatever philosophers spoke well, was elaborated well by them in proportion to their part of the Logos (κατὰ λόγου μέρος).<sup>2</sup> For each man spoke well in looking at things of mutual affinity from his part of the Spermatik divine Logos (ἐκάστος γάρ τις ἀπὸ μέρους τοῦ σπερματικοῦ θείου λόγου τὸ συγγενὲς ὁρῶν καλῶς ἐφθέγγετο).<sup>3</sup> Attention must be drawn here to Justin's use of λόγος θεῖος which we noted was an element added to Logos by Philo.<sup>4</sup> For all the writers were able to see reality dimly through the implanted seed of the Logos existing in them (οἱ γὰρ συγγραφεῖς πάντες διὰ τῆς ἐνούσης ἐμφύτου τοῦ λόγου ὁποῦς ἀμυδρῶς ἐδύναντο ὁρᾶν τὰ ὄντα).<sup>5</sup> For the seed of something and imitation of something given in accordance with a man's potential is one thing, and quite another thing is the thing itself, a share in which and an imitation of which arises from the grace which comes from it (ἕτερον γὰρ ἐστὶ σπέρμα τινὸς καὶ μίμημα κατὰ δύναμιν δοθέν, καὶ ἕτερον αὐτὸ οὐ κατὰ χάριν τὴν ἀπ' ἐκείνου ἢ μετουσία καὶ μίμησις γίνεται).<sup>6</sup>

There are unmistakable undertones of Platonism in these passages. But the term σπερματικὸς λόγος is found only twice. Before one can see precisely what is the nature of Spermatikos Logos, it is necessary to consider its functions and exactly what the μέρος of the Logos or the ἐμφύτον σπέρμα mean. What was this μέρος in a man? What actually does the ἐμφύτον σπέρμα do? Allied to

<sup>1</sup> II Apol. x,1.

<sup>2</sup> ibid. x,2.

<sup>3</sup> ibid. xiii,3.

<sup>4</sup> See p. 89.

<sup>5</sup> II Apol. xiii,5.

<sup>6</sup> ibid. xiii,6.



these concepts, we find in Justin the use of  $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\chi\omega$  and  $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\theta\epsilon\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ , both of which are well known technical terms in Platonism.<sup>1</sup> We have also noted the frequent use of the terms  $\mu\acute{\iota}\mu\eta\mu\alpha$  and  $\mu\acute{\iota}\mu\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$ . The term  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\kappa\omega\upsilon$  is also a word familiar in Justin's writings. An essential teaching of the Platonists was that matter is an imitation of the eternal Ideas. Things exist because in some way they share in real Being. This sharing of real Being is not the same thing as an overshadowing of transcendent Being or as if the whole of this ultimate and real Being is in someway diffused or thinly distributed into separate things. Plato uses the same  $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu \dots \acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\rho\epsilon\upsilon$  contrasts as Justin.<sup>2</sup> Plato can speak of human participation in God:  $\kappa\alpha\theta\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\epsilon\nu \delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon \grave{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\acute{\omega}\pi\omega \mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\iota\nu$ .<sup>3</sup>

But Justin obtained his ideas from the concepts of Middle Platonism where there was no exact identity of the eternal Logos and whatever responded to this in a man's soul. In Middle Platonism the end and purpose of man was  $\delta\mu\omicron\iota\omega\iota\varsigma \theta\epsilon\omega\grave{\iota} \kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha} \tau\acute{\omicron} \delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu$ .<sup>4</sup> We have noted above that Justin accepts the restriction of  $\kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha} \tau\acute{\omicron} \delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu$  on what results from his possession, of the  $\delta\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\mu\alpha \lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\upsilon$  and presumably his  $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\theta\epsilon\epsilon\iota\varsigma \lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\upsilon$ . 'In no religious speculation before the time of Neoplatonism is there any serious attempt to combine transcendence with immanence.'<sup>5</sup> If this is so, we can readily understand Plutarch's statement:  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\kappa\omega\upsilon \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu \omicron\upsilon\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma <\acute{\eta}> \acute{\epsilon}\nu \acute{\upsilon}\lambda\eta\grave{\iota} \gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota} \mu\acute{\iota}\mu\eta\mu\alpha \tau\omicron\upsilon \acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma \tau\acute{\omicron} \gamma\iota\nu\acute{\omicron}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu$ .<sup>6</sup> We must therefore agree with R. Holte that the terms

<sup>1</sup> e.g. I Apol. xlv, 2; Dial. vi, 1.

<sup>2</sup> e.g. Plato, Soph. 259A:  $\tau\acute{\omicron} \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu \mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omicron\nu \tau\omicron\upsilon \acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\acute{\sigma}\tau\iota \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \delta\iota\acute{\alpha} \tau\iota\upsilon\tau\eta\nu \tau\eta\nu \mu\acute{\epsilon}\theta\epsilon\epsilon\iota\nu, \omicron\upsilon \mu\grave{\eta}\nu \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron \gamma\epsilon \omicron\upsilon \mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\nu \acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda' \acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu$  cf. Justin, Dial. vi, 1:  $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu \delta\acute{\epsilon} \tau\iota \tau\acute{\omicron} \mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omicron\nu \tau\iota\nu\epsilon\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\upsilon \omicron\upsilon \mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\iota$ .

<sup>3</sup> Plato, Phaedrus, 253 A.

<sup>4</sup> Albinus, Didask. xxviii (ed. Hermann); cf. Plato, Theaet. 176 B.

<sup>5</sup> R.E. Witt, Albinus, p. 123.

<sup>6</sup> Plutarch, de Iside, 53 (ed. J.G. Griffiths).

λόγος σπερματικός and τὸ σπέρμα τοῦ λόγου are not necessarily identical.<sup>1</sup>

Hitherto this identity has been assumed. All the terms, noted as Platonist and used by Justin, of man's participation in Logos (e.g. μετέχω, μέθεξις, εἰκών, μίμημα, μίμησις, σπέρμα and μέρος) denote a possession of Man and not an extension or a radiation (ἀπορροία) which can be interpreted metaphorically. We must not baulk even at the expression of Justin's: τὸ παρὰ Θεοῦ σπέρμα, ὁ λόγος.<sup>2</sup> Here τὸ σπέρμα is employed as a metaphor of ὁ λόγος and this idea of the Logos as residing in a man, we have noted above.<sup>3</sup> Justin follows the Middle Platonist line and we would expect to find that the σπέρμα τοῦ λόγου is sown in him by the Spermatic Logos and that this sperma is a μίμημα of the true Logos. Man, for example, to the Middle Platonist Philo is a μίμημα of the Divine Logos.<sup>4</sup> When Philo uses the expression λόγος σπερματικός, he sees it as opening the womb of several senses e.g. of the mind, for mental apprehensions of speech, for the activities of the voice etc.<sup>5</sup> Albinus states that human souls were sent down by God to their earthly head,<sup>6</sup> reflecting Plato's belief that God sowed (ἐσπειρε) human souls.<sup>7</sup>

But for all this Justin is not profoundly committed to speculation about the cosmology of Logos, his second God. His interest is focussed more on the nature of the Son, Jesus Christ. 'For I say that He (the Second God) has never at any time done anything which He who made the world - above whom there is no other God - has not wished Him both to do and to engage Himself with.'<sup>8</sup> Justin is quite sure that Christ 'is also

<sup>1</sup>R. Holte, 'Logos Spermatikos', Studia Theologica, Vol. xii, Fasc.ii (1958), Lund, pp.109-168. At this point, the work of the present writer is greatly indebted to the study of Holte.

<sup>2</sup>I Apol. xxxii,8.

<sup>3</sup>e.g. II Apol. x,8: λόγος γὰρ ᾧ καὶ ἐστὶν ὁ ἐν παντί ὢν.

<sup>4</sup>Philo, de Opif. Mundi, 139.

<sup>5</sup>id. Quis Dives. 119.

<sup>6</sup>Albinus, Didask. xvii., cf. xvi (ed. Hermann).

<sup>7</sup>Plato, Tim. 42D.

<sup>8</sup>Dial. lvi,11.



God according to His (God's) will, His Son, and He is an Angel because He ministers to God's purpose'.<sup>1</sup> Justin does not explain what he means by the Spermatic Logos although all men possess within themselves a part of it in the form of a seed.

The mediator Logos by projecting itself in part and by sowing a seed, produced new life and new being similar to their origin. We must suppose that Justin would accept with Philo that the Spermatic Logos was involved in this spiritual activity whereby His true, creative role was undertaken. Justin's view that God created the world with the apparent contradiction that the world was made *διὰ τοῦ λόγου*<sup>2</sup> is made clear. It makes more explicable Justin's statement that God delays causing the destruction of the world because of the seed of the Christians which in its place in nature He knows is ultimate cause.<sup>3</sup>

Justin refers often to a part of man which has a close association with the Divine Logos. A divine particle, his reason, is in every man and before the coming of Christ, this was man's best guide to living life well. The Spermatic Logos activates men by sowing a seed in them so that instead of living *ἄνευ λόγου*, they can now live *μετὰ λόγου*.<sup>4</sup>

Trypho argues with Justin: *ὅταν δέῃ τὴν ψυχὴν μηκέτι εἶναι, ἀπέδωκεν ἅπ' αὐτῆς τὸ ζωτικὸν πνεῦμα*.<sup>5</sup> What is unique to Man is not *τὸ ζωτικὸν πνεῦμα* which all living forms possess, but the sperma sown by the Spermatic Logos. This seed is a higher attribute and possession. When Justin is asked by Trypho what affinity is there between us and God and when the latter also asks: *ἡ καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ θεία καὶ ἀθάνατος ἐστὶ καὶ αὐτοῦ ἐκείνου τοῦ βασιλικοῦ νοῦ μέρος*; Justin answers in the affirmative.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> ibid. cxxvii,4; cf. lx,3.

<sup>2</sup> e.g. II Apol. v(vi),3.

<sup>3</sup> II Apol. vi(vii),1: *ὁ θεὸς ... ἐπιμένει ὁ θεὸς τὴν κατὰ λυθὶν τοῦ παντὸς κόσμου μὴ ποιῆσαι... διὰ τὸ σπέρμα τῶν Χριστιανῶν ὃ γινώσκει ἐν τῇ φύσει, ὅτι αἰτίον ἐστίν.* This is a notoriously difficult and ambiguous passage; scholars vary in their interpretation.

<sup>4</sup> I Apol. xlvi,3,4.

<sup>5</sup> Dial. vi,2.

<sup>6</sup> ibid. iv,2.

The higher part of man is the seed sown by the Spermatic Logos. The Logos Himself is present in all men because it is a creating and ruling agency, a power of the Father.<sup>1</sup> Through this presence of the Logos, men who lived before Christ were led to prophecy. But the presence of the seed sown by the Spermatic Logos adds a new dimension: ἕτερον αὐτὸ οὐ κατὰ χάριν τῇ ἀπ' ἐκείνου ἡ μετακτὶς καὶ μίμνῃς γίνεται.<sup>2</sup> The possession of this seed gives a share in the divinity of the Logos-Christ. This is in accord with St. Paul's statement to the Galatians when he emphasizes that promises were made to Abraham and his seed, but not to τοῖς σπέρματι, ὡς ἐπὶ πολλῶν, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐφ' ἐνός, καὶ τῷ σπέρματι σου, ὅς ἐστιν Χριστός.<sup>3</sup>

In spite of C. Andresen's fine research into the Logos Spermatikos,<sup>4</sup> there is little between the Logos Spermatikos and the seed He sows to connect with the Stoic concept of semina iustitiae enunciated by Cicero.<sup>5</sup> Much of this Stoic concept was shared and expounded by Aristotle<sup>6</sup> who taught that virtue was believed to come to men not φύσει, but rather κατὰ φύσιν, the nature of men being formed so that goodness may result from practice. Cicero is quite sure that the origin of virtue lies in these seeds of virtue: sunt enim ingeniis nostris semina innata virtutum, quae si adolescere liceret, ipsa nos ad beatam vitam natura perduceret. Cicero derives much of his ethical teaching from Antiochus of Ascalon (ob. circ. 68 B.C.) who for all his Platonist pretensions was a true Stoic. est enim natura sic generata vis hominis, ut ad omnem virtutem percipiendam facta videatur, ob eamque causam parvi virtutum simulacris, quarum in se habent semina, sine doctrina moventur; sunt enim prima elementa naturae, quibus auctis virtutis quasi germen efficitur.<sup>7</sup> Seneca adds his authority: facile est auditorem concitare ad

<sup>1</sup> II Apol. x, 8.

<sup>2</sup> ibid. xiii, 6.

<sup>3</sup> Gal. iii, 16.

<sup>4</sup> C. Andresen, 'Justin und der mittlere Platonismus', Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, xlv (1952-53), pp. 157-195.

<sup>5</sup> Cic. de Fin. Bon. v, 15, 43; cf. Andresen, loc. cit. 171f.

<sup>6</sup> e.g. Aristotle, Eth. Nic. II, 1.

<sup>7</sup> Cic. de Fin. Bon. v, 18, 43. Andresen (loc. cit. p. 171) admits that progress is made possible because a love of knowledge is implanted in the spirit of men.



cupidinem recti: omnibus enim natura fundamenta dedit semenque virtutum.<sup>1</sup>

Andresen claims that Arius Didymus (fl. c. 30 B.C.) in giving an ethical explanation of λόγοι σπερματικοί, formed a link between Antiochus, Cicero and the Middle Platonists. A man at his birth bears in himself seeds of good and evil and it is the function of education to train these seeds for good.<sup>2</sup>

The concepts of ἐμφυτοὶ προλήψεις and of κοινὰ φυσικὰ ἐννοιαί, familiar to the Stoics as ethical and moral ideas, were derived in their view from human nature. They were not in any way to be construed as the same as inborn 'ideas' familiar to the Platonists. This would fly in the face of the basic and most elementary tenet of the Stoics who believed that at birth the essence of a man's inner being was quite void of any knowledge; it was man's φύσις which was created in a way receptive to later experience and knowledge. A man was born empty of ideas and what he learned was derived from experience. Such knowledge can derive from outer experience, as well as from inner experience, hence ἐμφυτοί. To the Stoics therefore, human reason, the Logos, was indistinguishable from the Universal Logos which was diffused through all matter. There were as many λόγοι σπερματικοί as there were human beings. The Middle Platonists understood that inborn ideas pre-existed just as the immortal soul pre-existed and that knowledge was really recollection. Andresen<sup>3</sup> seems to me to make this fundamental error in identifying the Logos Spermatikos with the actual σπέρματα καὶ αἰθύγματα which in our view were only the products of the Logos Spermatikos. It is therefore doubtful to what extent the Stoic λόγοι σπερματικοί were the same as Cicero's semina virtutum. It would seem that Holte's interpretation that the semina virtutum were entirely the product of the λόγοι σπερματικοί is entirely sound and that there might be a change of meaning on the part of Cicero who might be interpreting his semina as inborn conceptions derived directly from Nature. If Logos Spermatikos, Holte argues, and the spermata have never been identical in Stoic philosophy and if Cicero was changing the function and origin of semina

<sup>1</sup> Sen. Epist. 108,8.

<sup>2</sup> Apuleius, de Plat. ii,3 (ed. Thomas).

<sup>3</sup> C. Andresen, op.cit.

from their Stoic connotation, there seems little foundation for a belief that these concepts became identified in a philosophy where Logos was believed to be transcendent and immaterial.<sup>1</sup>

Although L.W. Barnard has a favourable estimate of Andresen's researches and believes that the latter has provided an intelligible account of the term Logos Spermatikos,<sup>2</sup> in the end he does not commit himself, but is content to state Justin's debt to Middle Platonism, rather than to Stoicism directly.<sup>3</sup> H. Chadwick finds an echo of Justin's Logos Spermatikos in the Parable of the Sower.<sup>4</sup> We may think of the distinction between the σπέρμα and the μέρος of the Logos as an immanent revelation in every man; but full knowledge and the real truth arises with the revelation of Christ Himself. The first is a partial revelation and was κατὰ δύνατον, enabling those who lived before Christ to speak a part of the truth. An acceptance of the Stoic doctrine of λόγος σπέρματικός would have conceded much to Gnosticism. There was one Logos Spermatikos in Stoicism, it is true; but it was not transcendent and it did not proceed from the Father. It was the ultimate expression or resolution of complete harmony<sup>5</sup> which held the dissonant parts of the cosmos together and prevented it from breaking up.<sup>6</sup> But this Logos Spermatikos was no

<sup>1</sup> R. Holte, op. cit. p.138. For a full explanation of the nature of σπέρματα in the thinking of Chrysippus, see Aetius, Plac. iv,21 (= Stoic. Vet. Frag. II,836).

<sup>2</sup> L.W. Barnard, Justin Martyr: His Life and Thought (1967), p.97.

<sup>3</sup> ibid. p.99.

<sup>4</sup> H. Chadwick, 'Justin Martyr's Defence of Christianity', Bulletin of John Rylands Library, xlvii (1965), 294, n.11.

<sup>5</sup> of. Plut. de Isid. 55: τὸ πᾶν ὁ λόγος διαρροδάμενος συμφωνον ἐξ ἁρμονικῶν μερῶν ἐπείγεται κτλ. (ed. Griffiths).

<sup>6</sup> Philo. de Fug. 112: ὅτε γὰρ τοῦ ὄντος λόγος δεδμένος ὢν τῶν ἀπαντων . . . καὶ συνέχει τὰ μέρη πάντα καὶ ἐφίγγει κωλύων αὐτὰ διαλυεσθαι καὶ διαρροῦσθαι.



Mediator between God and His people, between Creator and creatures. This Stoic Logos Spermatikos separated into countless and different Logoi Spermatikoi as we have noted above. There are no echoes here of the prooemium to St. John's gospel where the Logos came to men in toto and in person. The concept of Logos was freely used in the various Gnostic systems. In these however, He is only one mediator among many who stood between transcendent, unknowable Divinity and the fallen world.

There was always a danger too that the individual Logoi Spermatikoi might be confused with individual souls. Justin would condemn as un-Christian the teaching that the Soul is taken to heaven at the death of the body; this teaching would conflict with the belief in the resurrection.<sup>1</sup> Theophilus of Antioch will not answer the question whether the soul is mortal or immortal by nature: 'it is naturally neither, but is capable of becoming either one or the other'.<sup>2</sup> The early Christians knew the dilemma that the souls of the faithful departed have died with the whole man and must wait for the general resurrection or the Soul must be capable of living in separation from its body as a higher and immortal part of the human life and existing forever in its own nature. This was a source of conflict between Platonism and Christianity. A belief in Logoi Spermatikoi as higher and immortal parts of a man's being (since they were fragments of the true Logos Spermatikos), could only accentuate such a conflict.

The Alexandrians were compelled to take over the Hellenist concept of the soul's immortality, but not at the expense of identity with the World Soul or the cosmic Logos Spermatikos. The Logos was the Saviour and Redeemer of every human soul per se. Origen went further in teaching the pre-existence of souls.<sup>3</sup> Because the soul is immaterial, he said, it had neither a beginning nor end. It belonged to the eternal world. The belief of his predecessors that the world would end in a conflagration and that there would occur a resurrection of the dead belongs to Stoicism since creation and renovation are the work of the Logos.<sup>4</sup> But this Origen

<sup>1</sup> e.g. I Apol. lii, 3.

<sup>2</sup> Theoph. ad Autol. ii, 24.

<sup>3</sup> Origen, de Princ. I, 8, 1; IV, 3, 10 (ed. Koetschau).

<sup>4</sup> e.g. id. con. Cels. v, 15-19 (ed. Koetschau).

accepted and maintained that in each man there is a single Logos Spermatikos, the principle of differentiation of one man from another, and that seeds were sown in the earth and eventually produced other bodies.<sup>1</sup> But this is a long way from Justin's concept of the Logos-Son.

The discussion leaves us with no other conclusion than that Justin saw the Logos Spermatikos as a transcendent figure. To accept the Stoic doctrine that the Logos Spermatikos was an immanent revelation in every man would have led Justin away from his own concept of the Logos who was the Son of God, born of a virgin and who suffered here on earth before ascending to His Father in Heaven. This made him an inhabitant of another world, with a pre-existence as well as a post-resurrection existence in the heavens. It was all too easy for Justin to see in the being of this heavenly Logos an angelic figure. We have already studied this briefly.<sup>2</sup>

Certainly in Christian traditions of the second century A.D., there was an Apostolic, Angelomorphic imagery surrounding the figure of Christ. Justin has several direct references to this. Christ is the ἄγγελος μεγάλης βουλῆς<sup>3</sup> and it was evidently to angelology that many Christians turned in order to define the relationship of Christ to God. Justin explains his use of 'the angel of the Lord' when he refers this expression to Christ. 'He who is called God and appeared to the patriarchs is called both Angel and Lord, in order that from this you may understand Him to be minister to the Father of all things'.<sup>4</sup> Sources for an angelomorphic tradition are preserved in the O.T. 'The Angel of His presence' is linked very closely with God and His saving work in

<sup>1</sup> ibid. of. iv,48 where Origen refers with approval to the view of Chrysippus who says that matter receives the Spermatikoi Logoi from God and contains them in itself for the ordering of the universe. of. in Jo. xx,5 (ed. Preuschen) where the Logos Spermatikos comes from physical heredity.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 71 cf.

<sup>3</sup> Dial. cxxvi,1. See p. 71.

<sup>4</sup> ibid. lviii,3; cf. ibid. cxxvi,4-5.



Isaiah, lxiii,9. 'The Angel of God'<sup>1</sup> appears frequently; 'the Angel of the Lord'<sup>2</sup> or simply 'the Angel'<sup>3</sup> speaks and acts often.

Justin interprets many of the O.T. passages where the Angel manifests itself as theophanies.<sup>4</sup> The LXX translates 'the children of Israel' of Deut. xxxii,8 as 'the angels of the nations' and 'at His right hand was a fiery law for them' of Deut. xxxiii,2 with 'at His right hand were His angels with Him'. The God of the O.T. was a living God, not the impersonal, abstract idea of Greek metaphysical philosophy. Consequently the Jews saw nothing strange in His using agents like angels to perform His will.

Philo's God was abstract Being and all that could be said of his God was that It is, eternally, never changing, without feeling, ineffable. For Philo and the Platonists, the abyss between such an Abstraction and the world of matter needed a link and the Middle Platonists therefore conceived of intervening ideas such as Nous, the intelligence of the cosmos and Psyche, the soul of the universe. Philo's particular intermediary was Logos; but like Justin, in making Logos 'a second God' above which was the unknowable, transcending God, Philo made this very different from the Stoic Logos which was the immanent Reason of the Universe although in the eclectic manner of the age, there were considerable borrowings.

Where God manifests Himself to men, Philo understood this to be the Logos. Justin, as we have seen, saw in these theophanies none other than the Logos-Christ and this divine intermediary as we saw above was given angelomorphic expression. But this accretion was not only a Middle

<sup>1</sup>Gen. xxi,17; xxxi,11; Exod. xiv,19; Judg. vi,20; xiii,6,9.

<sup>2</sup>Gen. xvi,7-11; xxii,11,15; Exod. iii,2; Numb. xxii,22-35; Judg. ii,1,4; v,23; vi,11-22; xiii,3-21.

<sup>3</sup>Gen. xlviii,16.

<sup>4</sup>e.g. Gen. xviii,1-33. Here the angels who appeared at Mamre conversed with Abraham; but from vv.22 it is Yahweh who speaks as one of the angels (Dial. lvi,1ff; Gen. xix,1-22). Here the angels before Lot in Sodom become in vv.17-21 a single angel who is addressed as God (Dial. lvi,14ff).

Platonist contribution. The idea of a divine intermediary was adopted and modified in certain of the N.T. authors e.g. Hebrews, Colossians, John. But the intermediary is not angelo-morphic.<sup>1</sup>

The Dead Sea Scrolls have a developed angelology especially in 1QS, 1QH, 1QM. In much of these works, angels play a large part in redemption. They assist men to become acceptable to God;<sup>2</sup> they carry the prayers of men to God.<sup>3</sup>

St. Paul's letter to the Galatians has several references to angels. He condemns a gospel preached even by an angel from heaven if it is contrary to the gospel he preached.<sup>4</sup> He contrasts the covenant of Christ with the Law ordained by angels through an intermediary.<sup>5</sup> He equates himself with an angel of God<sup>6</sup> and it is possible to interpret this as indicating that his manifestation as an angel of God was to be preferred to another and he links Christ Jesus with the same preference.<sup>7</sup> It has been thought that his converts among the Galatians were attempting to develop an angelology to the diminishing of Jesus Christ who was publicly portrayed as crucified.<sup>8</sup> Perhaps behind the epistle lies a form of angelomorphic Christology unacceptable to St. Paul. St. Paul elsewhere urges his readers not to be beguiled by the worshipping of angels.<sup>9</sup> In Hebrews, the author wants to point to the primacy of Christ over other angels and the opening chapters would seem to indicate that 'the Hebrews' held an alternative Christology which the writer wished to minimize. The particular forms of angelomorphism of current beliefs may be seen in an Angelic liturgy from Qumran.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>1</sup> But cf. Rev. xiv.

<sup>2</sup> e.g. 1QS 3,18ff (= Eng.Trans.G. Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls in English, 75f); 1QM 13,9f (= Vermes, ibid. pp.140-141).

<sup>3</sup> e.g. 1QH 6,13 (= Vermes, ibid. p.170).

<sup>4</sup> Gal. i,8.

<sup>5</sup> ibid. iii,19.

<sup>6</sup> ibid. iv,14.

<sup>7</sup> ibid.

<sup>8</sup> R.N. Longenecker, The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity, p.31.

J. Daniélou, The Theology of Jewish Christianity, p.187.

<sup>9</sup> Col. ii,18.

<sup>10</sup> The Angelic Liturgy at Qumran (Congress Volume, Oxford), Suppl. to Vet. Test. vii, Leiden, pp.318-45 = G. Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls in English, pp.211-213.



One of the charges levelled against the Jews by the Christians was that of 'angel-worship' as in the Gospel of Peter.<sup>1</sup> Justin would certainly appear to be influenced by an angelomorphic concept of the Logos-Christ. He is quite specific in places: (God) ΕΚΕΙΝΟΝ ΤΕ ΚΑΙ ΠΑΡ' ΑΥΤΟΥ ΥΙΟΝ ΕΛΘΟΝΤΑ... ΚΑΙ ΤΟΝ ΤΩΝ ἈΛΛΩΝ... ἈΓΓΕΛΩΝ ΟΤΡΑΤΟΝ... ΕΒΕΒΟΜΕΘΑ ΚΑΙ ΠΡΟΒΚΥΝΟΥΜΕΝ.<sup>2</sup> Christ-Logos is given the names of Angel and Apostle frequently by Justin.<sup>3</sup> 'There is another God and Lord subject to the Maker of all things who is also called Angel.'<sup>4</sup> 'He who is called God and appeared to the patriarchs is called both Angel and Lord in order that you may understand Him to be minister to the Father of all things.'<sup>5</sup> Justin believes that the theophanies of the O.T. are best explained in angelomorphic terms. Christ is therefore of the same order of being as angels; angels are of the same substance as the Logos-Christ.

In the language of apocalyptic, good and evil angels, wicked demons with their Prince at their head appeared on all sides. Justin derived the name of Satan (who had fallen as a result of his deceit of Eve)<sup>6</sup> from 'apostate' - 'serpent'.<sup>7</sup> When God made the world, he committed the care of men to angels whom He appointed over them. But the angels transgressed this appointment and captivated by love of women, begat children who are those who are called demons. These afterwards subdued the human race to themselves, partly by magical writings, partly by fears and punishments, partly by teaching men to offer sacrifices, incense and libations.<sup>8</sup> This view of God's ordering of the world Justin might have derived from Jewish-Christian tradition or from Platonism.

<sup>1</sup> Clem. Strom. vi,5

<sup>2</sup> e.g. I Apol. vi,2.

<sup>3</sup> e.g. I Apol. lxiii; Dial. xxxiv,2; cxxvi,1 et al.

<sup>4</sup> Dial. lvi,4.

<sup>5</sup> Dial. lviii,3.

<sup>6</sup> Dial. cxxiv,3.

<sup>7</sup> Dial. ciii,5. This derivation is also known to Irenaeus, adv. Haer. v,21,2; cf. Dial. cxxv,4.

<sup>8</sup> II Apol. iv(v),3-4.

Belief in angels is ascribed by current scholarship to the impact of Babylonian and Assyrian influence in the Middle East. The Lord's command to Raphael was to cast out Azazel into darkness and to heal the earth which the angels have corrupted.<sup>1</sup> The Angel Watchers fell from grace after lusting after the daughters of men.<sup>2</sup> This is the teaching of Jude, 6-7.<sup>3</sup> The demons according to I Enoch xvi,1 are the spirits who were the children of fallen angels and the daughters of men. These demons worked moral ruin on the earth and would do so until the final judgement. Satan appears in I Enoch as the ruler of an opposing kingdom of evil, yet a kingdom subject to the Lord of Spirits. He led angels astray and made them his subjects.<sup>4</sup> Justin would be at home in the demonology of I Enoch. He describes the Devil: ὁ ἀρχηγέτης τῶν κακῶν δαιμόνων ὅφιος καλεῖται καὶ βατανᾶς καὶ διάβολος.<sup>5</sup> The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs contain a vast demonology much of which would be familiar to Justin.<sup>6</sup>

The demons in Greek belief were not always maleficent; within their own province they exercised a divine influence sometimes good, sometimes bad. According to Plato, demons occupied an intermediary position between a god and a mortal.<sup>7</sup> Timaeus of Locri believed that the administration of the world had been entrusted to demons.<sup>8</sup> Plutarch

<sup>1</sup> I Enoch, x,7 (ed. Charles).

<sup>2</sup> ibid. vi-xvi.

<sup>3</sup> cf. II Pet. ii,4.

<sup>4</sup> I Enoch, liv,6; lxix,5 (ed. Charles).

<sup>5</sup> I Apol. xxviii,1; cf. Rev. xii,9: ὁ ὅφιος ὁ ἀρχαῖος ὁ καλούμενος Διάβολος καὶ ὁ Σατανᾶς; ibid. xx,2; cf. Gen. iii,1.

<sup>6</sup> R.H. Charles, The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the O.T. Vol.II, pp.296-297 (with refs.).

<sup>7</sup> Plat. Symp. 202a: καὶ γὰρ πᾶν τὸ δαιμόνιον μεταξὺ ἐστὶ θεοῦ τε καὶ θνητοῦ

<sup>8</sup> Ocellus, III,3 (ed. Harder 40) = C.J. De Vogel, Greek Philosophy III, 1280o.



maintains that demons were intermediate powers between God and man.<sup>1</sup> In the view of Philo, spiritual beings floated in the air between earth and heaven and were identified both with the demons of classical authors and the angels of the O.T.<sup>2</sup> Maximus of Tyre gives a full description of powers which are intermediate between God and man.<sup>3</sup> Albinus as typical of the Middle Platonists says: εἰς δὲ καὶ ἄλλοι δαίμονες, οὓς καὶ καλοῖν ἂν τις γενήτοῦς θεοῦς κτλ.<sup>4</sup> Apuleius claims: ceterum sunt quaedam divinae mediae potestates inter summum aethera et infimas terras in isto intersitae aëris spatio ... hos Graeci nomine δαίμονας nuncupant.<sup>5</sup> If Justin wished to use ideas of angels and demons from his apocalyptic sources, he would find little difficulty in communicating these ideas to those schooled in Hellenist philosophy.

J. Daniélou claims that one of the characteristics which is genuinely archaic and Jewish Christian is the use of terms borrowed from the vocabulary of angelology to designate the Word.<sup>6</sup> He defines the word 'angel' as a force and it connotes in his view a supernatural being manifesting itself. The nature of this being is not determined by the expression, but by the context.<sup>7</sup> Because in many cases a subordinationist tendency is implied by this terminology,<sup>8</sup> a rapid decline in the use of this range of ideas occurred after the first three centuries A.D. We see in Justin that the word 'Angel' was used of Israel: 'He (sc. the Word) was also called Israel, and he bestowed this name on Jacob'.<sup>9</sup> Trypho also asks, 'I would like you to teach me the power (δύναμις) of the name Israel',<sup>10</sup> and he receives the reply

<sup>1</sup> Plut. de defectu oracul. x, 414F-415C: οἱ τὸ τῶν δαιμόνων γένος ἐν μέσῳ [θεῶν καὶ ἀνθρώπων] (Loeb).

<sup>2</sup> Philo, de gigant. 6.

<sup>3</sup> Max. Tyr. Philosoph. xi, 12a-e (ed. Hobein).

<sup>4</sup> Albinus, Didask. xv, 1 (ed. Hermann).

<sup>5</sup> Apul. de deo Socratis, 6 (ed. Thomas).

<sup>6</sup> J. Daniélou, The Theology of Jewish Christianity, I, 117 ff.

<sup>7</sup> ibid. p. 118.

<sup>8</sup> ibid. p. 119.

<sup>9</sup> Dial. lxxv, 2; cf. cxiv, 2; cxxx, 3; cxxxiv, 6; cxxxv, 1, 3.

<sup>10</sup> ibid. cxxxv, 1.

from Justin that the angel who appeared to Jacob 'because he was the first born of all creatures, yet nevertheless is God ... Israel was His name from the beginning to which He altered the name of the blessed Jacob.' <sup>1</sup>

Daniélou, it needs to be observed, states that in Justin  $\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$  refers purely to the function of messenger, its ordinary Greek usage 'as may be seen from the fact that he applies it indifferently to the Word, to angels and to men.' <sup>2</sup> Apart from a single reference to Dial, lxxv,3, he discusses only those usages which clearly refer to non-human beings. The reference to Dial, lxxv,3 is extremely weak: 'now Isaiah shows that those prophets who are sent to publish tidings from God are called His angels.' Justin specifically explains this at Dial. cxxv when he says: the angel who appeared to Jacob 'because he was the first born of all creatures, yet nevertheless is God ... Israel was His name from the beginning to which He altered the name of the blessed Jacob.' <sup>3</sup> John the Baptist was considered by Origen to be  $\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$  in human form. <sup>4</sup> As we saw above, Justin seems to follow Philo: 'The firstborn Logos is the eldest among the angels; he is archangel and has many names, being indeed 'Beginning', 'Name of God', 'Word', 'Israel.' <sup>5</sup> Origen is familiar with the same angelology as that of Philo and Justin. <sup>6</sup> In the Test. Dan. vi,1-2, we read: 'Draw near unto God and unto the angel who intercedes for you, for he is a mediator between God and man.' A similar theme occurs in Test. Levi,v,6: 'I am the angel who intercedeth for the nation of Israel.' If Justin looked to Jewish Christianity for descriptions of the Logos-Christ, he would find the designation of Angel there as designating a mediator. But this was something less than full Godhead. Tertullian lets us know that the Ebionites thought of Christ as only man 'though more glorious than the prophets because they claim that an angel was in Him'. <sup>7</sup> Epiphanius also described the belief of the Ebionites that Christ was not begotten of God the Father, but created as one of the archangels. <sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> ibid. cxxv, passim.

<sup>2</sup> J. Daniélou, Gospel Message and Hellenistic Culture, pp.160-161.

<sup>3</sup> Dial. cxxv.

<sup>4</sup> Origen, in Joh. ii,31 (ed. Preuschen).

<sup>5</sup> Philo, de Conf. Ling. 146-147.

<sup>6</sup> e.g. Origen, in Jo. ii,31. (ed. Preuschen).

<sup>7</sup> Tert. de carn. Christi, xiv,5 (ed. Migne).

<sup>8</sup> Epiph. Haer. xxx,16,4 (Migne).



Elsewhere Christ was designated as the greatest archangel.<sup>1</sup> The Lord is described frequently by the Shepherd of Hermas as 'angel'.<sup>2</sup> Origen identifies two seraphim (cf. Isaiah, vi,3) as the only-begotten Son of God and the Holy Spirit.<sup>3</sup> It would appear that the theme of Christ conceived of as an angel was very strong in early Jewish Christianity. But the possibility of a link with the Ebionites might be examined further. Trypho says that the views of Justin about the divinity of Christ are less plausible than the views of those who affirm Him to have been a man and to have been anointed by election and then to have become Christ.<sup>4</sup> Perhaps Trypho is referring to an Ebionite belief that it was at the baptism of Christ that the change took place.<sup>5</sup> Epiphanius is our authority for this.<sup>6</sup> But even if Trypho is not accusing Justin of anything which might be thought Ebionite, it is in the Gospel of the Ebionites that this sect claimed (according to Epiphanius) that Christ was created as one of the archangels.<sup>7</sup> To the Ebionites, Judaism was not so much a preparation for Christianity as a way of life of value in itself and only slightly modified by Christianity. They saw the Christian faith as an extension and as a supplement to Judaism. The divine origin of the Old Covenant was an earnest and the only true token for the validity of the New Covenant. Because of the value they put on the O.T. they extolled the worth of the prophets especially Moses. Legal righteousness was the summum bonum. Justin's view would not be totally dissimilar were it not for his belief in the Logos-Christ. But he has a deep sympathy with the O.T. and uses its writings widely and universally to interpret the Logos-Christ event.

<sup>1</sup>Clem. Hom. xviii,4; Clem. Recog. ii,42.

<sup>2</sup>Hermas, Vis. v,2; Sim. v,4,4; vii,1-3,5; viii,1,1-2; ix,1,3; ix,12,7-8.

<sup>3</sup>Origen, Princ. i,3,4 (ed. Koetschau).

<sup>4</sup>Dial. xlix,1.

<sup>5</sup>cf. Matt. iii,13ff. This is a passage strongly tinged with Ebionite doctrine.

<sup>6</sup>Epiph. Haer. xxx,13 (Migne).

<sup>7</sup>Epiphan. Haer. xxx,16, 4 (Migne).

Justin does not condemn the Old Covenant as bad; it is simply inadequate. He acknowledges that the Mosaic law was good and righteous.<sup>1</sup> But it is inadequate because it was binding only on Jews;<sup>2</sup> it was not absolutely essential since the great men who lived before Moses were unaware of the Law.<sup>3</sup> "But we do not trust through Moses nor through the Law ... Christ was given to us - an eternal and final Law and a faithful covenant."<sup>4</sup> In the view of Justin, Christians who continue to practise the Mosaic law will be saved although he says such Christians should not proselytize. Much of this is a matter of degree. It is the Logos-Christ for Justin who consummates the Old Covenant. The Ebionites, he must surely claim, did not take things far enough. Justin's beliefs would seem to have been rooted in elements of heterodox Judaism. But we can take this further.

We have observed above how specific Justin is in giving the status of Angel to the Christ-Logos and the angel who appeared to Jacob was the first-born of all creatures ... is God ... Israel was His name ... to which He altered the name of Jacob.<sup>5</sup> This is the same thinking as in the Gnostic Prayer of Joseph from which Origen gives extracts: 'He who speaks to you, I Jacob and Israel, am an angel of God and a principal (ἀρχικόν) spirit ... I, Jacob, my name is Israel ... because I am the first-born ... from God'.<sup>6</sup> Origen is familiar with the tradition which makes the Christ-Logos an Angel: ὁ ... ὁ ωτῆρ ... γέγονεν ἀνθρώποις ἀνθρώπος καὶ ἀγγέλους ἀγγελος.<sup>7</sup> This is admittedly later than Justin, but the tradition is well developed. Clement of Alexandria tells us too: 'Jesus ... emptied himself, that is ... he went forth outside Horos and, being an Angel of the Pleroma, he brought forth with Himself the angels of the superior seed.'<sup>8</sup> This Gnostic statement is as specific as Justin's.

<sup>1</sup> Dial. xlv,3; cf. Dial. xliii,1; xlv,5,7.

<sup>2</sup> ibid. xxvii,2.

<sup>3</sup> ibid. xix,3.

<sup>4</sup> ibid. xi, passim.

<sup>5</sup> Dial. cxxv passim.

<sup>6</sup> Origen, in Joh. ii,31 (ed. Preuschen).

<sup>7</sup> ibid. i,31; cf. Origen. Hom. viii,8 in Gen.

<sup>8</sup> Clem. Exo. ex. Theodt. 35,1 (ed. Stahlin).



In relation to the effort of Justin to explain every O.T. theophany as the Logos, it is significant that in the system of Basilides, the creator angels occupy the lowest heaven and made the world, their chief being the God of the Jews. We have noted elsewhere that whatever the Christ-Logos did, it was done by the will of God. Irenaeus refutes this teaching of Basilides that the world was created by angels without the knowledge or against the will of the Supreme God.<sup>2</sup> The God of the Jews was an angel.<sup>3</sup> In the system of Valentinus: τὸν δημιουργόν ... ἄγγελον θεῶ ἐοικότα.<sup>4</sup> There is an advanced angelomorphology of the exalted Lord in the Shepherd of Hermas who speaks of the glorious angel, the most venerable angel, the holy angel and the angel of the Lord. Origen identifies, as we have seen, the two seraphim of Isaiah, vi,3 as being the only begotten Son of God and the Holy Spirit<sup>5</sup> and thereby shows how strong was the direct link in the tradition from the author of Hermas to his own day.

The author of the Epistula Apostolorum, writing in the 2nd century A.D. states in the Coptic version that Christ passed by the angels and archangels in their form, as if He were one of them.<sup>6</sup> Origen applies the term to Christ and refers to his angelic aspect.<sup>7</sup> Clement of Alexandria refers us to its Gnostic application to Christ.<sup>8</sup> Gregory of Nyssa shows how its use by Arians developed.<sup>9</sup> We can see that Justin lies in the mainstream of angelomorphic concepts of the Logos-Christ.

<sup>1</sup> Irenaeus, adv. Haer. I,24,4.

<sup>2</sup> ibid. ii,2,1.

<sup>3</sup> ibid. i,24,2; Epiphan. Haer. xxiii,2 (Migne).

<sup>4</sup> Irenaeus, adv. Haer. I,5,2.

<sup>5</sup> Origen, Princ. I,3,4 (ed. Koetschau).

<sup>6</sup> E. Hennecke, N.T. Apocrypha, I,p.198 (Eng. trans.).

<sup>7</sup> Origen, in Joh. xix,6 (ed. Preuschen); cf. ibid. i,31: ὁ ... ὡτὴρ ... γεγονεν ἄνθρωποις ἄνθρωπος καὶ ἀγγέλοις ἀγγελος.

<sup>8</sup> Clem. exc. ex Thdot. xxv (Stählin).

<sup>9</sup> Greg. Nyss. Eun. 3: οὗτος εἰς ἀγγέλου τάξιν κατὰγει τὸν τῶν ἀγγέλων κύριον.

Sources for an angelomorphic Christology could of course be discovered in Judaism before the Christian era. There is a very close connection in Isaiah lxiii,9 between God who was afflicted by the sufferings of His people and the angel of His presence who saved them. In view of Justin's positive identification of such angelic appearances with the Logos, these pre-Christian O.T. sources cannot but have been acceptable to him. This claim is strengthened by a description of the angelomorphic Logos Christ in Justin as appearing ἐν εἰκόνι ἀσωμάτῳ.<sup>1</sup> The references are to O.T. theophanies of the Logos.<sup>2</sup> But a description of angels in the terms ἐν εἰκόνι ἀσωμάτῳ<sup>3</sup> or διὰ εἰκότος ἀσωμάτου,<sup>4</sup> is not biblical. ἀσώματος is not found in the LXX or N.T.

ἀσώματος was a convenient apophatic term in the various Greek philosophical systems. Epicurus used the word in a proof that the soul was incorporeal with a direct consequence that death is nothing to mortal men.<sup>5</sup> Aetius in making a comment on the difference between ἀρχαί and στοιχεῖα, says that the former are ἀσώματα.<sup>6</sup> Moderatus belongs to the 1st century A.D. and he describes the Ideas of the Platonists as ἀσώματα.<sup>7</sup> In the second century Numenius full as he was with Platonist metaphysics, describes οὐσία and οὐν as τὸ ἀσώματον.<sup>8</sup> The word was a useful term to describe extra-mundane concepts. As has been said it was not used in the LXX or N.T. where ἀόρατος was preferred.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>1</sup> I Apol. lxiii,10; lxiii,16.

<sup>2</sup> e.g. Gen. xviii,1-33; cf. Dial. lvi,1ff.

<sup>3</sup> I Apol. lxiii,10.

<sup>4</sup> ibid. lxiii,16.

<sup>5</sup> Epicurus, Ad Herod. ap. Diog. Laert. x,67 (Loeb).

<sup>6</sup> Aetius, Plac. I,3,25 (= Doxographi Graeci.289 ed Diels).

<sup>7</sup> Porphyry. Vita Pythag. 48-51 (ed. Nauck).

<sup>8</sup> Numenius, Fragments, 6,3; 6,7; cf. 6,15; 7,2; 4a,28,32 (E de Places).

<sup>9</sup> In LXX: Gen. i,2 (אֱלֹהִים), Isaiah, xlv,3 (אֱלֹהִים), unseen, invisible; Rom. i,20; Col. i,15,16; I Tim. i,17; Heb. xi,27.



Origen notes that it is not found in the scriptures which prefer  $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ , equated with  $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma$  or  $\nu\omicron\upsilon\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma$  :  $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$  οὐκ ἴεαθιν οὐ μόνον οἱ πολλοί, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἡ γραφή.<sup>1</sup> He observes elsewhere: διχῶς ... τὸ φῶς  $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$  ἐστὶν... ὡς μὲν αἱ γραφαὶ, αὖ λεγσιν  $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ , ὡς δ' αὖ Ἕλληνες  $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$  ἐστὶν  $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ .<sup>2</sup> It seems an obvious word for Justin to use when he refers to  $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$   $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ ;<sup>3</sup> but it only comes into favour in the Fathers later than Justin. For example, Gregory of Nyssa says:  $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$  ... τὸ χωρὶς ὁράματος τὴν ὑπόστασιν ἔχον.<sup>4</sup> The source of meaning in the word is Platonist. But it was a dangerous word for Justin to use of the Christ. If anyone favoured it in Justin's day, the Gnostics certainly did.

It was employed to describe Christ's human nature among Docetists: τὸν δὲ πατέρα [ὡτῆρα] ἀγέννητον ὑπέθετο, καὶ  $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ ... δοκήσει δὲ ἐπιπεφηνέναι ἀνθρώπινον.<sup>5</sup> In the Acts of John, we are informed: 'sometimes when I meant to touch him, I encountered a material, solid body; but at other times, again, when I felt him, his substance was immaterial and incorporeal ( $\alpha\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\omicron\nu$  καὶ  $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ ).'<sup>6</sup> The word became an important term in Apollinarian Christology.<sup>7</sup> Gregory of Nyssa divided the creation into two natures: μεμέριβται πάντα ἢ λογικῇ κτίσει εἰς τε τὴν  $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$  καὶ τὴν ἐν  $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$  φύσιν;<sup>8</sup> these he termed: ἐστὶ δὲ ἀγγελικῇ μὲν ἢ  $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ , τὸ δὲ ἕτερον εἶδος ἡμεῖς οἱ ἄνθρωποι. The evidence is scanty; but  $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$  does not seem to have been used of the nature of heavenly beings except by Justin and the Gnostics during the first two centuries of the Christian era. The word seems to have been borrowed from Hellenism and utilized by Docetists and others. Justin's thinking patterns seem to have been formed in these circles.

<sup>1</sup> Orig. Princ. proem. 8 (ed. Koetschau).

<sup>2</sup> id. in Jo. 13,22 (ed. Preuschen).

<sup>3</sup> Dial. i,5.

<sup>4</sup> Greg. Nyss. Eun. 12 (ed. W. Jaeger).

<sup>5</sup> Irenaeus, adv. Haer. I,24,2

<sup>6</sup> Act. Jo. 93 (trans. E. Hennecke, N.T. Apocrypha, II, p.227).

<sup>7</sup> Apoll. frag. 67 ap. Greg. Nyss. Apoll. 35 (ed. Jaeger).

<sup>8</sup> Greg. Nyss. Or. Dom. 4 (ed. Landshut).

### Mediation

In a discussion of the relationship of the Son to the Father in Justin, one of the principal problems is to establish an identity for Christ and to attempt a description of what Justin thought was His function. So many of our author's proof texts are drawn from the LXX and are at great length that whatever his fundamental debt to Hellenistic philosophy, the influence of early Jewish Christianity, whether Hellenistic or Palestinian, was nevertheless immense. The various appellatives for Jesus have to be weighed against the impact of this complex environment as they were used by Justin and we have to set these against the pattern of what Justin says the Christ actually did. Christ, Son of Man, Logos, Son of God are all terms used of a pre-existent figure who became incarnate, who later was crucified and was exalted to the side of God the Father in heaven. In heaven, the Christ causes certain apocalyptic events and Justin's eschatological beliefs are based on his expectations about the Christ. It will be necessary to look at these expectations and beliefs before one can delineate a well-defined portrait of the Word, of Jesus Christ, of the Son of God and His relationship with the Father. Without this we shall not be able to consider His function in that relationship.

Despite the fact that the N.T. has no consistent doctrine on the next life and on the sequence of events that will terminate history, the doctrine of the Last Things has become a final article in the Creeds.<sup>1</sup> Perhaps Justin played a part in this since he certainly made statements about the position of Christ in the next life which had no source in the N.T.

Apocalyptic is a large element in Justin's concept of Christology. Christ was the central figure in God's design for His creation after the parousia. Apocalyptic literature before and after the turn of the Christian era refers to presentiments that the situation on the terrestrial plane will terminate if not in the immediate future, then in the foreseeable time to come. 'Surely I come quickly' is in the penultimate verse of Revelation.<sup>2</sup> Two thousand two hundred and ninety

<sup>1</sup>R.P.C. Hanson, The Attractiveness of God, pp.192-194.

<sup>2</sup>Rev. xxii,20.



days separate the time that the daily sacrifice shall be taken away and the abomination that maketh desolate, according to Daniel.<sup>1</sup> Within the N.T. scoffers ask about the non-arrival of the parousia.<sup>2</sup> The author of I Clement quotes Isaiah, xiii,22 (LXX) in referring to 'He shall come quickly'.<sup>3</sup>

Justin states that the times are now running on to their consummation after (Jesus Christ) rose from the dead and He whom Daniel foretells would have dominion for a time, and times, and a half, is even already at the door. Justin repudiates the belief of the Jews that 'the time' is a hundred years. Justin in claiming that the Man of Sin is already at the door, indicates that the last days are imminent and not according to Trypho's calculation of 350 years.<sup>4</sup> But elsewhere Justin explains why the parousia is delayed. In II Apol. vi(vii),1, Justin says that God has delayed the end of the world διὰ τὸ ὑπερμα τῶν Χριστιανῶν, ὃ γινώσκει ἐν τῇ φύσει ὅτι αἰτιόν ἐστι. A similar thought occurs at I Apol. xxviii,2 where God puts off the punishment of endless duration because of His regard for the human race.

The extended quotation of Daniel vii,9-28<sup>5</sup> refers to the Son of Man, the Ancient of Days, the Lord called Christ by the Spirit of prophecy and the establishing of God's reign on earth at the parousia. These concepts, all belonging to biblical apocalyptic literature, are used by Justin to attack Trypho's false belief in a far-distant parousia. The prince of wicked spirits will be sent into the fire with his host of demons and men who follow his commands will be punished for an endless duration while God delays the parousia.<sup>6</sup> This delay is the result of the regard of God for the human race.<sup>7</sup> God has supreme direction over these events and we have no evidence that Christ was a co-regent or a co-equal in the after-life. At no time does Justin deny a parousia although he does not make up

<sup>1</sup> Dan. xii,11.

<sup>2</sup> e.g. II Pet. iii,3-4.

<sup>3</sup> I Clement, xxiii,5.

<sup>4</sup> Dial. xxxii (Passim).

<sup>5</sup> Dial. xxxii.

<sup>6</sup> I Apol. xxviii,1.

<sup>7</sup> ibid.

his mind between the inconsistencies of a view of the parousia which is imminent and that which is delayed. As far as the parousia is concerned, God is the one who wields direction in the relationship between Himself as Father and the Logos-Christ as Son.

In the thoughts of the Jewish apocalyptic writers, the 'last days' time has a connection with the linear dimension of world time. The history of our universe was divided into pre-determined times and ages.<sup>1</sup> Certain numbers have apocalyptic significance e.g. four and seven.<sup>2</sup> At the beginning of a new era, the boundaries between earthly time and eternity will vanish away and the good on earth will go to heaven.<sup>3</sup> Justin followed the accepted view among the Christians in believing that Christ with his angels would suddenly appear in the clouds of heaven.<sup>4</sup> The resurrection would follow this event when we may expect to receive again our own bodies, though they be dead and cast into the earth.<sup>5</sup> Justin argues that the Jews ought not to object to this since they have the same belief.<sup>6</sup>

Justin also believed that after the resurrection Jesus will give us our possession forever and this is He who is to shine in Jerusalem as an everlasting light.<sup>7</sup> Wherefore men, believing on Christ, are aware that they will be together with Him in that land.<sup>8</sup> There is no doubt that one can read Justin as believing that the resurrection and the judgement together with the building of an everlasting kingdom at Jerusalem will happen simultaneously. But Justin elsewhere describes his belief in a millennium and reign of the saints in Jerusalem and that this millennium terminates with a resurrection of the dead, in anticipation of the last judgement.<sup>9</sup> Christ will spend a thousand years in Jerusalem, followed by

<sup>1</sup> e.g. Rev. xx,6ff. Dan. ix; II Baruch, 27 (ed. Charles); IV, Ezra, vii,28 (Eng. Trans. R.H. Charles, The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the O.T. in English, II, p.582).

<sup>2</sup> e.g. Dan. ix,25; I Enoch, 88 (ed. Charles).

<sup>3</sup> e.g. Rev. xxi; Dan. xii,3; I Enoch, 51; II Baruch, 51,5 (ed. Charles).

<sup>4</sup> I Apol. li,8-9; lii,3; Dial. xxxi,1.

<sup>5</sup> I Apol. xviii,6.

<sup>6</sup> ibid.

<sup>7</sup> Dial. cxiii,3-5.

<sup>8</sup> ibid. cxxxix,5.

<sup>9</sup> ibid. lxxx,5.



the universal judgement and resurrection, as prophesied by John.<sup>1</sup> At this point Justin supports his view with quotations from Isaiah, lxv, 17-25 and Psalms, xc,4. 'Even if anyone be labouring under a defect of body, yet be an observer of the doctrines delivered by Him, He shall raise him at his second advent perfectly sound, after He has made him immortal and incorruptible and free from grief.'<sup>2</sup>

It is sufficient to say that Justin anticipated a golden age in the future and we must not seek to reconcile the two conflicting opinions of Justin in detail. In the classical world, a new age was a familiar theme. The prospect of a new age with the certainty of national salvation was promulgated by a great increase in Sibylline oracles. Lucan tells that the golden age will commence with an apotheosis of Nero.<sup>3</sup> Cosmic revolution was the meaning of a trumpet sound from a clear sky which preceded the civil war of 86 B.C.<sup>4</sup> The apocalyptic elements in Virgil's Fourth Eclogue are familiar.<sup>5</sup> Whatever the identity of the child as a magnum incrementum in this eclogue, the humanity of both parents was no obstacle to his divinity.

Alexander the Great was born in a miraculous way.<sup>6</sup> Hercules was born of the union of Zeus and Alomena and became a superman, even immortal on account of his exploits. The Epistle to the Romans declares that Jesus Christ, made of the seed of David was declared to be Son of God by the resurrection.<sup>7</sup> Christ was recognized as Son by his achievements in prayer and supplication, with crying and tears according to the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews.<sup>8</sup> The Epistle to the Galatians assumes a divine origin for the Son although born of a woman.<sup>9</sup> The nature of the

<sup>1</sup> ibid. lxxxi,4.

<sup>2</sup> ibid. lxix,7.

<sup>3</sup> Lucan, Phars. i,72ff.

<sup>4</sup> Plutarch, Sulla,7,445.

<sup>5</sup> Virg. Ecl. iv,6.

<sup>6</sup> Plutarch, Alexander, 2-3 (665b).

<sup>7</sup> Rom. i,3-4.

<sup>8</sup> Heb. v,5-8.

<sup>9</sup> Gal. iv,4.

divine Son was determined in the N.T. by the 'miraculous event' of the Resurrection, by His exploits or by His divine birth. As we have seen above, such recognition was bestowed on individuals for similar reasons in classical history. It would seem therefore that Justin could speak to Jews and Gentiles about epochs of this world's history, capable of verification by men, but having inseparable links with an otherworldly life about which selected individuals possess knowledge, acquired through apocalyptic events. The function of the Son was therefore a principal element in God's design for the future.

We can see that Justin has clear ideas about the part which the Logos-Christ played in the creation and ordering of the world. We have seen above how He performed all things albeit through the will of God.<sup>1</sup> Justin sees too that Christ is an essential figure in the events of the parousia and that He will establish a new Jerusalem and a new age. In all these things, He is a subordinate figure, an agent of the Supreme God. The Gnostics also made statements about this physical, cosmological agent. But Christ in Christian thinking was not simply an agent of God in His creating all things. We need to look at the reasons for the Incarnation. Although Justin describes the incarnate Christ and his cosmological role by using the language and ideas of Platonism, this will not suffice for us if we are to study in more depth the relationship between the Son and the Father. We shall need to look at Justin's concepts of Redemption and Atonement since these ideas are absolutely central in that relationship.

That there would be a final disaster, Jewish and Christian apocalyptic writers were certain. But it was also their belief that salvation would follow. The faithful remnant who had remained in their obedience to God would indeed receive this salvation; for those who had died, salvation would follow resurrection.<sup>2</sup> Justin does not appear to feel horror for sin. He rarely if at all links salvation with deliverance from the enormity of evil. Although he is quite sure of the fact that Jesus Christ saves, only in a few references does he indicate from what it is that

<sup>1</sup> See pp. 72 - 75.

<sup>2</sup> Rev. xx,4-6; Dan. xii,2; II Bar. 50 (ed. Charles); IV Ezra, vii,32; (Charles.op.cit.); I Enoch, xxii,51 (ed. Charles).



Jesus saves. In one reference he indicates that Jesus saves us from sins.<sup>1</sup> But even this is not his own conclusion since he quotes from a gospel. This quotation seems to combine elements from Matthew and Luke,<sup>2</sup> although a more accurate source is the Protevangelium of James.<sup>3</sup> Justin seems to have used the same non-canonical source when he refers to the birth of Jesus in a cave<sup>4</sup> and ascribes a Davidic descent to Mary.<sup>5</sup> The blood of Christ is that by which those who were at one time harlots and unrighteous persons are saved, receiving remission of sins.<sup>6</sup> God foreknows that some are to be saved by repentance.<sup>7</sup> God too declared that He would break the power of the serpent which occasioned the transgression of Adam and would bring ... salvation from the fangs of the serpent, which are wicked deeds, idolatries and other unrighteous acts.<sup>8</sup> Justin is clear that salvation is deliverance from sin, but he only states this in so many words in these remarkably few references. Elsewhere, salvation is something which follows, or it is given or it is something to which one goes. The concept of the act of salvation is employed absolutely and has few references to what it is man is delivered from except where it has been shown above. Admittedly, salvation from sin is implied frequently throughout Justin, but it is in terms like 'no curse lies on the Christ of God, by whom all that have committed things worthy of a curse are saved.'<sup>9</sup>

If salvation denoted the idea of reconciliation with God, we look in vain for this concept in Justin's works. In one passage, our author says: 'Jesus Christ ... becoming man according to (God's) will ... taught us these things for the conversion and restoration (ἐπὶ τῶν ἀλλήλων καὶ ἐπαναγωγῇ) of the human race.'<sup>10</sup> Neither of these words are

<sup>1</sup> e.g. I Apol. xxxiii (bis).

<sup>2</sup> Luke, i,32; Matt. i,21.

<sup>3</sup> Protevangelium of James, xi,2 (Eng. trans. M.R. James, The Apocryphal New Testament, p.43).

<sup>4</sup> ibid. xviii ff. cf. Dial. lxxviii,5.

<sup>5</sup> ibid. x,1; cf. Dial. o,3.

<sup>6</sup> Dial. cxi,4.

<sup>7</sup> I Apol. xxviii,2.

<sup>8</sup> Dial. xciv,2.

<sup>9</sup> Dial. xciv,5.

<sup>10</sup> I Apol. xxiii,2.

emotive enough to be used of men who once enemies of God are now reconciled by the death of His Son and have won peace and union with the Father or a fuller life in union with Christ as a consequence of deliverance.  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\gamma\eta$ , an idea so strong in the Pauline passages of the N.T. is not found in Justin.<sup>1</sup>  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\omega$ <sup>2</sup> and  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\omega$ ,<sup>3</sup> peculiarly Pauline, are also absent. In His relationship with the Father, the Son does not appear to be the great Reconciler. Justin's  $\acute{\epsilon}\pi' \acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\alpha\gamma\eta\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\alpha\nu\alpha\gamma\omega\gamma\eta$  does not give peace.<sup>4</sup> The phrase does not imply union with the Heavenly Father or life in Christ.<sup>5</sup> Indeed life ( $\gamma\omega\eta$ ) in this sense is completely unknown to Justin. He nevertheless refers to Baptism as the water of life<sup>6</sup> or the Baptism of life.<sup>7</sup> When the compounds of this emotive verb  $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\omega$  expressed so much in N.T. thinking, it is strange that Justin should use such a neutral expression as  $\acute{\epsilon}\pi' \acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\alpha\gamma\eta\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\alpha\nu\alpha\gamma\omega\gamma\eta$ .  $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\alpha\gamma\eta$  is employed once in the LXX.<sup>8</sup> It is not used in the N.T. It appears once in the Christian parts of the Sibylline Oracles.<sup>9</sup> It would appear to be uncommon in the papyri too, only once appearing in a late 3rd cent.B.C. papyrus.<sup>10</sup> Lampe barely notices it.<sup>11</sup> Much the same observations can be made about the

<sup>1</sup> Rom. v,11;  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\gamma\eta\ \kappa\omicron\sigma\mu\omicron\upsilon$  ibid. xi,15;  $\delta\iota\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu\acute{\iota}\alpha\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\gamma\eta\varsigma$ , II Cor. v,18;  $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\gamma\eta\varsigma$ , ibid. v,19.

<sup>2</sup> II Cor. v,18,19; Rom. v,10; of a woman returning to her husband, I Cor. vii,11.

<sup>3</sup> Eph. ii,16; Col. i,20,21.

<sup>4</sup> John, xiv,27; Rom. v,1; Eph. ii,14-17; Col. iii,15.

<sup>5</sup> John, iii,15,16; xx,31; I John, v,11-12; Col. iii,3-4, II Tim i,1; Rom. v,10; Heb. x,20.

<sup>6</sup> Dial. xiv,1.

<sup>7</sup> Dial. xix,2.

<sup>8</sup> Wisd. vii,18 (where it is used of the alternation of the solstices); cf. Aq. Psalm, liv (lv),20.

<sup>9</sup> Orac. Sib. ii,157 (also in the sense of the change of seasons) (ed. Kurfess).

<sup>10</sup> P. Eleph. xiv,9:  $\tau\eta\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\iota\theta\iota\sigma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\alpha\gamma\eta\nu$  (ed. O.Rubensohn, Berlin 1907).

<sup>11</sup> Pat. Graec. Lex. s.v.  $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\alpha\gamma\eta$ .



phrase ἐπ' ἀναγωγῇ if this means 'for a return'. It is not known in the LXX. It is not found as a substantive in the N.T. and the papyri of the period do not seem to use it. The verbal sense implies 'putting out to sea' at all periods; but the verb also has a sacrificial sense (as in Acts, vii,41: ἀνήγαγον θυσίαν τῷ εἰδώλῳ). This sacrificial usage occurs in the late second century B.C. in an inscription: ἀναγαγὼν ἐκ τοῦ ἰδίου ταύρους δύο καὶ καλλιερή[εας] κτλ.<sup>1</sup> In this sense, ἀναγωγή became a common substantive in the Fathers of the 4th and 5th centuries A.D. to denote the exaltation of sense perception to divine realities.

Justin seems to know nothing of salvation in the sense that Man is held in slavery by sin and has to be bought out of his slavery at a price. He does not refer to the concept that the crucifixion was this price. Words like ἀγοράζω, ἐξαγοράζω so well-known in the N.T.<sup>2</sup> are not found in Justin. The concept of Jesus as a λυτρὸν paid to God for the release of man is also strange to the thought of Justin. In view of Justin's great reliance on the O.T. for illustration of his ideas, it is at first surprising that he does not make more of the analogy of the great deliverances of Israel and apply them to the deliverance of man by Jesus from sin. Whereas Justin uses λυτρῶ and its compounds to refer to redemption, he doesn't extend it to the N.T. thought patterns. D. Hill<sup>3</sup> has convincingly shown that the λύτρων words are often understood in the N.T. in terms of deliverance or emancipation except when they imply a payment made to gain freedom.<sup>4</sup> D. Hill claims that by applying the words to the death of Christ, the N.T. writers emphasise the idea of freedom (after the pattern of the great deliverances of Israel) and do not intend to

<sup>1</sup>Orientalis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae. 2 vols. ed. Dittenberger (Leipzig 1903-5) 764,47.

<sup>2</sup>ἀγοράζω e.g. I Cor. vi,20; vii,23; ἐξαγοράζω e.g. Gal. iii,13; iv,5.

<sup>3</sup>D. Hill, Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings, 49ff.

<sup>4</sup>e.g. Matt. xx,28; Mark, x,45; I Tim. ii,6.

convey a particular theory (the ransom theory) about the method by which this freedom was achieved on behalf of men. The field of meaning to which the words point is that of God's delivery of his people.<sup>1</sup> Where Justin employs the forms of λύτρον, his sense is anaemic and he does not tell us from what man is redeemed. He quotes the Septuagint,<sup>2</sup> sometimes at length.<sup>3</sup> He states that Hezekiah is not the redeemer of Jerusalem (implying that Jesus is its redeemer): καὶ ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ λυτρούμενος τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ.<sup>4</sup> Justin quotes the LXX (Psalm, lxxii) at length and says: ἐκ τόκου καὶ ἐξ ἀδικίας λυτρώεται τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν.<sup>5</sup> Quoting Ezekiel, xx,12, Justin claims it is God who redeems.<sup>6</sup> Elsewhere, 'we who have been called by God through the despised and shameful mystery of the cross ... are more faithful to God than you who were redeemed from Egypt.'<sup>7</sup> In an extensive quotation from Isaiah, the holy nation of the Jews is redeemed by the Lord.<sup>8</sup> This holy people is also redeemed by the Lord in a further passage from Isaiah, lxv,1.<sup>9</sup>

Two references to the redeeming work of Christ occur in the Dialogue. 'Even as our Christ, by being crucified on the tree and by purifying us with water, has redeemed ( λυτρώσατο ) us.'<sup>10</sup> This can scarcely mean here release by payment of a ransom since purification in baptism was not efficacious because of a ransom price. But again Justin says, 'We call Him (i.e. Christ) Helper and Redeemer ( λυτρωτήν ) the power of whose name even the demons fear.'<sup>11</sup> The references to a Redeemer are either contained in O.T. quotations and refer to God or the references

<sup>1</sup> D. Hill, op.cit. p.81.

<sup>2</sup> e.g. Ezek. xx,12 = Dial. xix,6; Isaiah, lxii,12 = Dial. cxix,3;

<sup>3</sup> e.g. Psalm, lxxii = Dial. xxxiv,5; Isaiah, lxii,10 - lxiii,6 = Dial. xxvi,3.

<sup>4</sup> Dial. lxxxiii,3.

<sup>5</sup> Dial. xxxiv,5.

<sup>6</sup> Dial. xix,6.

<sup>7</sup> Dial. cxxxi,3.

<sup>8</sup> Dial. xxvi,3; xxvi,4.

<sup>9</sup> Dial. cxix,3.

<sup>10</sup> Dial. lxxxvi,6.

<sup>11</sup> Dial. xxx,3.



(only a few in all) refer to the Christ almost by way of a conventionalized title of Redeemer. We cannot discern a clear argument from Justin that Christ himself was the  $\lambda\upsilon\tau\rho\omicron\nu$ .

$\lambda\upsilon\tau\rho\omicron\nu$  is regularly rendered as the LXX equivalent of  $\pi\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  and  $\lambda\upsilon\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  to describe God's deliverances and the emphasis is placed on 'release' rather than the ransoming process.<sup>1</sup> We cannot distinguish the relationship between the Son and Father very easily as we pursue the concept of  $\lambda\upsilon\tau\rho\omicron\nu$  seen by Justin.

There is no emphasis in Justin of yet another N.T. doctrine about salvation when sin is seen playing its part as a debt and where God has been seen as a creditor, satisfied with payment of this debt or where this debt is remitted. Death becomes the wages of sin.<sup>2</sup> Christ was perfectly obedient and in payment of the debt, he was crucified.<sup>3</sup> We have referred above to Dial. lxxvi,6 where Justin says: 'even as our Christ, by being crucified on the tree and by purifying us with water, has redeemed us'.<sup>4</sup> This is too vague to claim unequivocally that sin is here a debt where the Crucifixion is payment of that debt to a completely just Creditor. In Christian beliefs about salvation, there is a unique relationship between the Father and the Son; but one cannot discern the existence of this unique relationship if one turns to Justin's views on Salvation for clarity.

In God's plan for the universe, man needs remission of sins and Justin is clear about this. But how did sin and remission of sins affect the relationship between God and His Son? Justin does not seem to have to have an explanation about what enables man to receive salvation. The Son did not appear to intercede on man's behalf to the Father for remission ( $\alpha\phi\epsilon\omicron\iota\varsigma$ ) of sins for this seemed to occur in Justin as a result of lustral purification in some passages.<sup>5</sup> In other passages, repentance is also a pre-condition of remission.<sup>6</sup> Recognition of Christ

<sup>1</sup>D. Hill, op. cit. p.58.

<sup>2</sup>e.g. Rom. vi,23.

<sup>3</sup>e.g. Gal. iii,13; II Cor. v,21; Phil. ii,8; I Pet. ii,24; Heb. v,8; x,9.

<sup>4</sup>See p. 122.

<sup>5</sup>e.g. I Apol. lxi,10; lxvi,1; Dial. xliv,4.

<sup>6</sup>e.g. Dial. xcv,3; cxli,2.

(i.e. faith) goes hand in hand with repentance before salvation comes with remission of sins.<sup>1</sup> We must pray for remission of sins.<sup>2</sup> But only very infrequently is remission linked closely with 'the blood of Christ by which we received remission of sins'.<sup>3</sup> The Christian faith sees in the Atonement the precise relationship of the Father and the Son. However a Christian thinker interprets the Atonement, it is in that interpretation that he defines the link between Father and Son. If Christ was ever to be at one with His Father, a supreme sacrifice was needed and Christ in fact shed His very blood for us that we and He might atone. But this insight into the relationship of the Victim and the Almighty is absent from Justin. The more we study the functional element of that relationship as it is actively envisaged in the association between the Father and the Son in the act of Redemption, the more we are led to conclude that Justin's Christology lacked depth.

Despite the many references to the blood of Christ in Justin, he does not link this often with Salvation, at least not in the sense of a N.T. belief<sup>4</sup> that Christ, by his life and death, pure and free from blemish, was a sacrifice and expiation which cleansed from sin. Justin does not seem to see Christ as the new dispensation. The idea of propitiating God as one who is angry with a personal feeling against the man who displeases Him, is absent from N.T. belief. Equally the words ἱλάσκειν, ἱλαετήριος, ἱλασμός are not used in Justin. We need not take sides therefore between for example C.H. Dodd who claims, 'thus Hellenistic Judaism, as represented by the LXX, does not regard the cultus as a means of pacifying the displeasure of the Deity, but as a means of delivering man from sin'<sup>5</sup> and D. Hill who claims, 'ideas of propitiation are present and we may presume that the LXX translators conveyed them by the use of the word ἐξιλάσκεσθαι which had, as its regular meaning, in both classical and Koine Greek, the sense 'to placate' or 'to propitiate'.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> e.g. Dial. xcv, 3.

<sup>2</sup> e.g. I Apol. lxi, 2.

<sup>3</sup> Dial. cxi, 4.

<sup>4</sup> More particularly in John and Hebrews; cf. I John, i, 7; ii, 2; iv, 10; Heb. ii, 17; ix, 19-28; x, 10-12, 14, 26.

<sup>5</sup> C.H. Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, p. 93.

<sup>6</sup> D. Hill, op.cit. p. 35.



It is inevitable that we should proceed to discuss the Atonement a little further since this is an essential factor in the link between Father and Son. In the N.T. Christ's death had a sacrificial character and although the grace which arose from this sacrifice and the conditions on which it was received by men are not matters of debate, its actual nature and the way it operated in the relationship of Christ to God are subject to argument. It was not considered as a symbol or as an illustration by the Apostles. Judged superficially, the sacrifice of Christ could be seen as retribution and a sign that God had repudiated Jesus. Faith in the Risen Christ made such a conclusion difficult. It was not satisfactory merely to treat it as mystery and to show how it had been foretold in the O.T. The sacrifice of Christ found explanation when it was interpreted as a sacrifice of a victim, not as the means of punishing the victim's sin, but as a means of blessing to others. But the principle that remission of sins was dependent on the sacrificial element of the relationship between the Father and Son, although indisputably established, must still be dissected. For we must ask on what aspect of that relationship is dependent the sacrificial element.

In Justin, there is little emphasis on Christ as a sacrifice. He links the sacrifice of the bread and wine of the Eucharist with the statement of God in Malachi: 'I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord, and I will not accept your sacrifices at your hands',<sup>1</sup> by which Justin claims Malachi speaks 'of those Gentiles, namely us, who in every place offer sacrifices ( θυσίας ) to Him, the bread of the Eucharist and the cup of the Eucharist'.<sup>2</sup> This would indicate that if Justin considered Christ as a sacrifice, he intends it for the expiation of guilt, the leading purpose of the Levitical sacrifice.<sup>3</sup> Where Justin refers to this theme elsewhere, he refers to the sacrifice of one of two goats, the remaining one being sent away as the scapegoat and says this was 'declarative of the two appearances of Christ, the first in which the elders of the people and the priests, having laid hands on Him and put Him to death, sent Him away as the scapegoat; and His second appearance because ... in Jerusalem you shall recognize Him whom you have

<sup>1</sup> Malachi, i, 10-12.

<sup>2</sup> Dial. xli, 3.

<sup>3</sup> Exod. xxix, 36; Lev. viii, 15; Ezek. xliii, 20.

dishonoured and who was an offering for all sinners willing to repent... and keeping the other precepts likewise enumerated by Him ... which those believing in Jesus do.' <sup>1</sup>

But Justin does not see this sacrifice of Christ as writers of the later period of the O.T. considered expiation. At that time the prevalence of sin and its enormity invested the approach to God with a profound contrast between God's awesome holiness and human depravity. Justin's view of Christ's sacrifice is more ritualistic than this. Justin sees the sprinkling of the blood on each man's doorpost and lintel at the passover in the same way, namely that Christ was the passover and he was afterwards sacrificed.<sup>2</sup> We surely have here the penal substitution view where the desired results were obtained from God by the manner in which the sacrificial offering was conceived. Men who sinned were facing the wrath of God and they forfeited their lives. But by God's gracious favour, the sinner was permitted to substitute an immaculate victim (δὸν τῷ δικαιοτάτῳ καὶ μόνῳ ἀσπίλῳ καὶ ἀναμαρτήτῳ Χριστῷ ... αἰρόμεθα ).<sup>3</sup> To such a victim the sinner's guilt is transferred and the victim was put to death in the sinner's place. This vicarious death was welcomed by God, who, by reason of the satisfaction offered, accepted the devotee into his friendship. The cause of our acceptance by God is therefore the sacrifice of Christ. Justin does not seem to know anything of the view that the sacrifice of Christ was a symbol of a religious attitude on the part of the believer which was a condition of acceptance by God. The sacrifice of Christ to Justin was essential per se and not a vehicle for the demonstration of religious devotion. Justin's frequent parallelisms with O.T. types of sacrifice seem to confirm this opinion. The N.T. is quite clear that the death of Christ was a sacrifice.<sup>4</sup> To this extent Justin is in line with N.T. teaching. A saving efficacy was attached to the blood of Christ and His Cross throughout the N.T.<sup>5</sup> Justin is full of references to this e.g. 'we trust in the blood of salvation'.<sup>6</sup> As the blood of the Passover

<sup>1</sup>Dial. xl. 4-5; cxi,1.

<sup>2</sup>Dial. cxi.

<sup>3</sup>Dial. cx,6.

<sup>4</sup>περὶ φερᾶ : Eph. v,2; cf. Heb. ix,14. Θυσία : Eph. v,2; Heb.ix,26.

<sup>5</sup>e.g. Rom. iii,25; v,9; I Cor. x,16; Eph. i,7; ii,13; Col. i,20; Heb. ix,12,14; I John, i,7; v,6,8.

<sup>6</sup>Dial. xxiv,1.



saved those who were in Egypt, so also the blood of Christ will deliver from death those who have believed.<sup>1</sup> Christ served even to the slavery of the cross, for the various races of mankind, acquiring them by the blood and mystery of the cross.<sup>2</sup>

The N.T. is clear that benefits are procured by Christ's sacrifice. Man is set in a new relationship with God. In the letters of Paul, the sinner is justified or accepted as righteous.<sup>3</sup> The sinner receives the spirit of adoption;<sup>4</sup> he is reconciled with God<sup>5</sup>. Justin does not connect these benefits as deriving from Christ's death for us. He sees somewhat infrequently that among the benefits obtained for the sinner is the remission of sins.<sup>6</sup> Here and there is an occasional reference to the inheritance of the blessed, or being saved from condemnation to fire or a happy life. But little of this implies a saving from the penal consequences which the broken laws of God entail. There is nothing in Justin to indicate that our guilt is cancelled by the sacrifice of Christ.<sup>7</sup> We look in vain for the rich ideas expressed by the terms *λύτρον*, *ἀπολύτρωσις*, *ἐξαγοράζειν*<sup>8</sup> all of these connoting each in its own way, a relationship of the Son with the Father. The gifts of peace, joy, hope and assurance and similar benefits do not strike Justin as flowing from Christ's sacrifice.<sup>9</sup> Justin has no doubt that the Cross was an essential element in the work of the Redeeming Christ. For 'this, as the prophet foretold, is the greatest symbol of His power and rule'.<sup>10</sup> But nevertheless, the actual symbol of the Cross seems to derive a cosmic significance from Justin's view that the figure

<sup>1</sup> ibid. cxi,3; cf. I Apol. xxxii,7; Dial. xiii,1; cxi,4.

<sup>2</sup> Dial. cxxxiv,5.

<sup>3</sup> e.g. Rom. iii,24-26.

<sup>4</sup> Rom. viii,15.

<sup>5</sup> Rom. vi,11.

<sup>6</sup> Dial. cxi,4; I Apol. xxxiii,5,8. But see p. 124.

<sup>7</sup> cf. Heb. ii,17; I John, ii,2.

<sup>8</sup> See above pp. 121-123.

<sup>9</sup> cf. Rom. v,1ff.

<sup>10</sup> I Apol. lv,2ff.

of a cross can be seen in all sorts of objects e.g. the sail and a ship, the plough, tools and implements, the human form with arms extended. One cannot avoid a thought that the physical cross is playing a specific part in Justin's Christology when he thinks of Christ's Cross and the Crucifixion. Our suspicions are not allayed when we read of the part played in the O.T. by the various figures of the wood of Christ's cross.<sup>1</sup> Justin calls to our attention those men of the O.T. who used a wooden rod to effect miracles e.g. Moses divided the sea with his rod,<sup>2</sup> Jacob caused sheep to conceive,<sup>3</sup> David was comforted by a rod and a staff<sup>4</sup> and many other instances. The Cross would seem to be endowed with miraculous power. Moses uses this miraculous power of the shape of a Cross when the Amalekites were defeated.<sup>5</sup> The force of this mystery of the Cross was demonstrated in the mind of Justin by the shape of the horns of the unicorn and this is what effected a blessing for Joseph.<sup>6</sup> It is through the power of this mystery that men have turned from vain idols and demons to serve God.<sup>7</sup> Justin concludes that the type and sign of the Cross was intended for salvation.<sup>8</sup> It was the act of Christ on this mysterious symbol which played its part in exorcism and it is by this that every demon is subdued.<sup>9</sup> That Justin believed in exorcism through the crucified Christ is made clear elsewhere.<sup>10</sup> A formula for exorcism employed by Justin incorporates an emphasis on the Crucified Christ.<sup>11</sup> Christ would break the power of the Serpent by the mystery of the Crucifixion.<sup>12</sup> There are passages in Justin where Christ is seen as a wonderworker performing acts ἐπαίνοῦ ἀξίον καὶ θαυμασμοῦ.<sup>13</sup> Demons are overcome

<sup>1</sup>Dial. lxxxvi.

<sup>2</sup>Exod. xiv, 16.

<sup>3</sup>Gen. xxx, 38.

<sup>4</sup>Psalms, xxiii, 4.

<sup>5</sup>Dial. xc, 4; xci, 3.

<sup>6</sup>Deut. xxxiii, 13-17; cf. Dial. xci, 1-2.

<sup>7</sup>Dial. xci, 3.

<sup>8</sup>ibid. xci, 4.

<sup>9</sup>ibid. lxxxv, 2; cf. ibid. xxx, 3.

<sup>10</sup>e.g. ibid. xlix, 8; xciv, 2.

<sup>11</sup>Dial. lxxxv, 2; cf. xxx, 3.

<sup>12</sup>Dial. xciv, 2.

<sup>13</sup>Dial. c, 1. cf. I Apol. lxii, 4.



by the crucified Christ throughout Justin. During his temptation,<sup>1</sup> when he was exorcising,<sup>2</sup> at the moment of the Nativity,<sup>3</sup> Christ held dominion over demons and in fact was 'Lord of the powers'.<sup>4</sup> Before Christ the crucified, all demons, all the principalities and powers of the earth, tremble.<sup>5</sup> Daniélou<sup>6</sup> considers that Jewish Christian theology is a theologia gloriae in which the accent is placed on the victory of Christ and its cosmic efficacy. This is especially apparent in the part played by the theology of the Cross. On the one hand, the fact that Christ had been crucified meant that the Cross was one of the historic data of His earthly life; on the other, it was from the very first, a cultic symbol which (as we have seen above in Justin) was an inheritance from pre-Christian Judaism and acquired further significance from the historic cross of Christ itself.

The cross according to Justin was a great sign ( σύμβολον ) of Christ's strength and power.<sup>7</sup> Its cosmic significance is seen by Justin when he asks us to consider all the things in the world whether without this form they could be administered or have any community.<sup>8</sup> This point is pursued by later writers.<sup>9</sup> The cross had a cosmic significance and a power per se among some Gnostics. The Excerpta ex Theodoto says that Horos and the Cross prevents [men] from entering the Pleroma.<sup>10</sup> The Cross was also an aeon, created great by the Father for the guarding of the aeons and as a limit for the Pleroma.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Dial. cxxv, 4.

<sup>2</sup> ibid. xlix, 8.

<sup>3</sup> ibid. lxxviii, 9.

<sup>4</sup> e.g. ibid. xxxvi, 2.

<sup>5</sup> ibid. xlix, 8.

<sup>6</sup> J. Daniélou, The Theology of Jewish Christianity, 265 ff.

<sup>7</sup> I Apol. lv, 2.

<sup>8</sup> ibid.

<sup>9</sup> e.g. Tertull. adv. Marc. iii, 18 (Migne); Min Fel. Oot. xxix, 8: ita signo crucis aut ratio naturalis innititur aut vestra religio formatur (Loeb).

<sup>10</sup> Clem. Exc. ex Theod. 22 (ed. Stahlin).

<sup>11</sup> Hippol. Refut. 31, 5 (ed. P.A. de Lagarde).

The Gospel of Peter demonstrates an independent existence of the Cross since it follows three men emerging from the Sepulchre and it answers a voice from the heavens.<sup>1</sup> An apocryphal Letter of the Apostles, possibly dating to the 2nd century A.D. describes in one of the versions the cross preceding Christ in the heavens.<sup>2</sup> The tree of the cross has a cultic, magical significance in the Acts of Pilate.<sup>3</sup> These references are of the same cultic vein as Justin's interpretation of Isaiah, ix,6: 'the government shall be upon his shoulders' which is significant of the power (τῆς δυνάμεως) of the cross.<sup>4</sup> How strongly the cross became as a cultic symbol is seen in the Acts of John: ὁ σταυρὸς οὗτος ὁ τοῦ φωτός ποτε μὲν λόγος καλεῖται... ποτε δὲ νοῦς, ποτε δὲ Ἰησοῦς... ποτε θύρα... ποτε ἄρτος... ποτε υἱός, ποτε πατήρ... ποτε πνεῦμα... ὁ δὲ οὕτως ἔστιν... διορισμὸς πάντων ἔστιν.<sup>5</sup> This is the cross ὁ διαπηξάμενος τὰ πάντα λόγῳ.<sup>6</sup>

We can now surely conclude that if Justin intended to give a cultic significance to the Cross because he considered it a cosmic symbol (as he certainly did) and because he was familiar with its use in exorcistic formulae, he was delineating his thoughts in a Gnostic mould. Justin believes the cross to have exorcistic powers and the visible characteristics of the cross, its substance, its shape and other attributes, he borrowed from the O.T. As Daniélou points out,<sup>7</sup> Philo had already subjected Scripture to a transformation in order to express his own theology through the images of Scripture. Justin engages in the same practice and Daniélou believes this turning of the O.T. into a mythology for theological purposes one of the characteristics of Jewish Christianity.

<sup>1</sup> Gospel of Peter (Eng. trans. E. Hennecke, N.T. Apocrypha, I, 10 (39), p.186).

<sup>2</sup> Epist. Apost. ibid. 16, p.200.

<sup>3</sup> Act. Pilat. ibid. viii(xxiv), p.475. Probably this work is of the IVth cent. A.D. and is therefore too late for our purpose; but cf. I Apol. xxxv; xlviii.

<sup>4</sup> I Apol. xxxv,2.

<sup>5</sup> Act. Io. 98 (ed. Lipsius) (= Hennecke, op. cit. II,232.).

<sup>6</sup> ibid. 99.

<sup>7</sup> J. Daniélou, op. cit. p.271.



A clear example of this in Justin is the type of Cross formed by Moses as he prayed with his arms in the form of a Cross.<sup>1</sup> The same thought occurs in the Epistle of Barnabas.<sup>2</sup> Isaiah, lrv,2 is quoted by Justin: 'All the day long have I stretched out my hands to a disobedient people.'<sup>3</sup> This reference is also used by the author of the Epistle of Barnabas.<sup>4</sup>

The texts looked at so far are discussed in some detail by Daniélou.<sup>5</sup> We have noted above that the Cross developed a cosmic significance. Justin had linked this with the Timaeus: 'Plato, in the Timaeus, seeks to discover, in accordance with the laws of Nature, what the Son of God is, and puts it in these words: "He has marked Him in the form of a X on all things."<sup>6</sup> Justin continues by alleging that the Timaeus showed that Plato was employing the parallel of the brazen serpent and because he didn't really understand, he said that next to God, the first principle, the second power was traced in the form of a X upon the universe.'<sup>7</sup>

Justin did not find alien to his thinking this entire range of concepts concerning the parallelisms, the typology or the cosmic significance of the Cross whether found in the O.T. or in some Gnostic thinking or in Hellenism. At all events, he did not see the meaning of the Cross as simply a metaphor of Christ's Death and Passion and he did not see the full saving significance of the Crucifixion. This is a harsh conclusion. But Justin cannot be shown to believe that the Crucifixion was an essential element for man's salvation. We have discussed salvation and redemption above and were unable to distinguish in Justin the concept of reconciliation of God and man; the concept of Christ as the

λύτρωσις is missing; the idea of man being the creditor of God with Christ paying man's debt in full is not present; we have not found much to indicate that Justin viewed Christ's sacrifice as propitiatory or placatory of God. Further to this, apart from a few references to remission of sins, we have found little of the benefits of salvation described in

<sup>1</sup> Dial. xc,5; xc,4; cxi,1; cxii,2; cxxxi,4.

<sup>2</sup> Barn. xii,2.

<sup>3</sup> Dial. xxiv,4; cxiv,2.

<sup>4</sup> Barn. xii,4.

<sup>5</sup> J. Daniélou, op. cit. pp.270-278.

<sup>6</sup> Plato, Tim. 36 B-C = I Apol. lx,1.

<sup>7</sup> I Apol. lx,5-6.

Justin, whether expiation of guilt, or justification of man. Instead we have found concepts of cultic worship where the Crucifixion was necessary per se; we have noted exorcistic powers attached to the Cross and some Gnostic leanings. Parallelisms with the O.T. there have been in profusion; but these relate to a typology which is cosmic. Of true Fatherhood and true Sonship, Justin has barely a superficial view. The death on the Cross of the only Son of God has little meaning for our author in true personal terms.

Among the Greeks, expiatory acts for reconciling angry gods and purificatory rites for dispelling the influence of demons were often combined. Vicarious sacrifices of animals were made and in special cases men were sacrificed and the death of these was considered an expiation. This ritual, originally common to primitive, animistic religions, maintained itself under the more sophisticated and official state-religions. Many of the mystery cults practised the most primitive ideas of sacrifice as a 'sacred communion' or communication of divine life through the blood of the sacrifice and in this the sacrificial meal played a large part. In Israel, the idea of expiatory sacrifice developed under the influence of the prophetic spirit<sup>1</sup> and as a result there arose the idea that the martyrs' death of the righteous possessed saving power.<sup>2</sup>

Justin stopped at this point. St. Paul applied these concepts of vicarious expiation to Christ and there the mystical thinking about Christ's death on the Cross began. In St. Paul the expiatory death satisfied the demands of righteousness and the Law; sinners were saved by the love of God while He judged at the same time. The death of Christ removed sin and made a satisfaction for sin. In the giving up of His only Son, God gave a pledge of His saving purpose. There is little evidence in Justin for one to conclude that he understood Redemption, Salvation or the Atonement in any of these terms. But it would simply not be true to conclude that Justin saw no significance in a blood rite attached to Christ, even if he seemed to have no insight into these functional aspects of the Father-Son relationship.

<sup>1</sup> Isaiah, liii.

<sup>2</sup> e.g. IV Macc. vi, 29.



In several passages, Justin refers to the blood of Christ as having a saving efficacy. 'And the blood of the Passover ... delivered those who were saved in Egypt ... For the Passover was Christ who was afterwards sacrificed. On the day of the Passover, you crucified Him. And as the blood of the Passover saved those who were in Egypt, so also the blood of Christ will deliver from death those who have believed.'<sup>1</sup> With further O.T. incidents in mind and quoting Genesis xlix,10-11, Justin concludes 'For the washing His robe in the blood of the grape was predictive of the passion He was to endure, cleansing by His blood those who believe on Him.'<sup>2</sup> 'Christ served', Justin claims, 'even to the slavery of the Cross, for the various races ... acquiring them by the blood and mystery of the Cross.'<sup>3</sup> Quoting Genesis xlix,11 once again (and he does this many times), Justin makes the point 'He shall wash His garments with wine and His vesture with the blood of the grape', signified that He would wash those that believe in Him with His own blood.'<sup>4</sup>

Of the references to the blood of Christ (some even having Gnostic nuances),<sup>5</sup> one is given a hint about the conditioning of Justin's thought. 'This was that saving bath of the olden time which followed those who repented and who were no longer purified by the blood of goats and sheep, or by the ashes of an heifer, or by the offerings of fine flour, but by faith through the blood of Christ and through His death who died for this reason.'<sup>6</sup> There is no use here of metaphor. Genesis ix,4 is the primitive source for this blood rite. The ancient Hebrew tradition carried back to the time of Noah, taught that the blood of animals, slain for human food, was forbidden. There was a piacular or expiatory efficacy of blood: 'without the shedding of blood is no remission'.<sup>7</sup> There was a cathartic or purificatory use of blood in the Jewish ceremonial cultus for uncleanness e.g. leprosy.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Dial. cxi,3.

<sup>2</sup> I Apol. xxxii,7.

<sup>3</sup> Dial. cxxxiv,5.

<sup>4</sup> Dial. liv,1.

<sup>5</sup> See p. 173.

<sup>6</sup> Dial. xiii,1.

<sup>7</sup> Heb. ix,22.

<sup>8</sup> Lev. xiv,5ff. 50 ff.

But Justin's emphasis on blood and its efficacy in the death of Christ, although owing much to O.T. parallels, has other connexions. Just as Justin could not escape from the conditioning effects of his thorough education in the Hellenist philosophical schools, so he was accustomed to the Asiatic cults and their ritual.<sup>1</sup> The ritual of the taurobolium originated in Asia Minor and was so popular that it was present even in the west of the Mediterranean in the cult of Venus Caelestis at Puteoli in A.D. 134.<sup>2</sup> In the period of Justin, many dedications to Cybele, the original great mother goddess of Anatolia and her youthful lover Attis, record the performance of the taurobolium ex vaticinatione archigalli. In this rite, the devotee descended into a ditch and was bathed in the blood of a bull or ram (criobolium) which was slaughtered above him.<sup>3</sup> The devotee was thoroughly washed in the blood and drank it with fervour. In faith, he was purified of his faults and became the equal of the deity in his baptism. Blood was the principle of life and by this purification the devotee gained a temporary or even an eternal rebirth of his soul.<sup>4</sup> Belief in immortality was part of the cult from early times. The young Attis, originally a vegetation god, was later identified with the Phrygian Zeus.<sup>5</sup> Under the Empire, he was invested with celestial attributes and became a solar god, supreme, all powerful and sometimes a surety of immortality to his devotees. The rites of Attis offered parallels to Christian cultus, if only because both referred to the body of a divine Son impaled on a tree.<sup>6</sup> In the rites of Attis, we have a Father manifesting Himself afresh in the person of the Son and a Son carrying the name of His Father.<sup>7</sup> Writing in the fourth century A.D. Firmicus Maternus is able to quote parallels: in sacris Frygiis, quae matris deum dicunt, per annos singulos arbor pinea caeditur

<sup>1</sup> I Apol. ix; xxv; Dial. lxx,1.

<sup>2</sup> ILS, 4271; but cf. ILS, 4099 (108 A.D.).

<sup>3</sup> Prudent. Perist. x,1011-50 (Loeb).

<sup>4</sup> cf. ILS, 4152 = CIL, vi,510: taurobolio criobolioque in aeternum renatus

<sup>5</sup> Dem. de cor. 260 (for full refs. see A.B. Cook, Zeus, I, p.399, n.3).

<sup>6</sup> Frazer, Golden Bough, Adonis Attis Osiris, i,267f.

<sup>7</sup> A.B. Cook, Zeus, II, 292ff.



et in media arbore simulacrum iuvenis subligatur: in Isiacis sacris de pinea arbore caeditur truncus, huius trunci media pars subtiliter excavatur: illic de segminibus factum idolum Osiridis sepelitur (cf. Plut. de Is. 8,16,18,21,42). in Proserpinae sacris caesa arbor in effigiem virginis formamque componitur et cum intra civitatem fuerit inlata, quadraginta noctibus plangitur, quadragesimum vero nocte comburitur.<sup>1</sup> The mourning over a body hung up on a tree, the appearance of light, the murmured words of consolation and comfort from the priest demonstrate the suggestive teaching of the cult: nocte quadam simulacrum in lectica supinum ponitur et per numeros digestis fletibus plangitur; deinde cum se ficta lamentatione satiaverint, lumen infertur: tunc a sacerdote omnium qui flebant fauces unguentur, quibus perunctis sacerdos hoc lento murmure susurrat:

Θαρεεῖτε μύδαται τοῦ θεοῦ δεδομένου.  
ἔβτα γὰρ ἡμῖν ἐκ πόνων σωτηρία.<sup>2</sup>

The devotee of Attis belonged to the flock of a divine 'Shepherd' and he could declare et ipse Pileatus Christianus est<sup>3</sup> where the pileum was the Phrygian cap. Firmicus Maternus is much later than Justin and there is no claim here that Firmicus is the key to understanding Justin. But Firmicus does illustrate the kind of cult practised by devotees in the Eastern Mediterranean.<sup>4</sup> Earlier references show that Attis, like Zeus, possessed the title Papas.<sup>5</sup> Justin's references to the Crucifixion and the blood of Christ's death and its saving power, as we have shown above, lack theological depth and if one strips his claims about the death of Christ of its O.T. parallels, one is surprisingly near the essential elements of the taurobolium, albeit sublimated. These

<sup>1</sup>Firm. Mat. Math. 27,1 (ed. Kroll).

<sup>2</sup>Firm. Mat. Math. 22,1 (ed. Kroll).

<sup>3</sup>A.B. Cook, op. cit. ii,307.

<sup>4</sup>F. Cumont, Les Religions Orientales dans le Paganisme Romain, passim.

<sup>5</sup>e.g. Diod. Sic. iii,58; Hippol. Refut. v,8; CIL, v,766 (Aquileia). See Paul-Wiss. Real. Enc. ii,2180. For Phrygian Zeus = Πάπας, JHS (1884), v,260, No.12; CIG, iii, No.3817; Class. Rev. (1904), xviii,79.

are important observations. We have studied in detail the nature of the Father in Justin and we have made a detailed analysis of the Son. These are matters of ontology. Where there exists a relationship between two entities, in this case the Father and the Son, this relationship must be analysed in terms not of distinct and disparate ontologies, but in terms of function. So far the death of Christ, in our opinion, illumines very little the nature of Redemption and practically nothing of the Atonement. Salvation seems to be a consequence of a cultic act of shedding blood and exorcism. If Christ was an instrument of salvation, what parallels can be found to modify an opinion that Justin thought in terms of Christ as a Saviour similar to his contemporaries, Christian or secular?

We noted above that Justin was not very precise about what Christ saved His believers from.<sup>1</sup> He occasionally stated that it was salvation from sin. But concepts of σωτηρία and the epithet σωτήρ were very common in the Hellenistic world.<sup>2</sup> In Justin σωτήρ used of Christ is a mere title.<sup>3</sup> Justin claims too that the name Jesus in the Hebrew language means Σωτήρ in the Greek tongue.<sup>4</sup> In Greek, the epithet is used of many gods e.g. Zeus, Asclepius, the Dioscuri and the Egyptian Isis and Sarapis.<sup>5</sup> It was applied to men to assert personal divinity. The title 'Saviour of the World' used by St. John,<sup>6</sup> was also applied to Julius Caesar, Augustus, Claudius, Vespasian, Titus, Trajan, Hadrian and other emperors on many inscriptions in the Hellenistic East. It may well have been that the title as applied to emperors was little more than a courtesy title. It was certainly otherwise with gods like Asclepius. The sphere of influence of this particular god increased during the Christian era of the early Empire. As this happened, deliverance and religious healing were sought. Gifts were showered on him as θεὸς σωτήρ and people dedicated their lives to him as countless inscriptions show.

<sup>1</sup> See p. 121 ff.

<sup>2</sup> See A.D. Nock, Early Gentile Christianity and its Hellenistic Background, 35 ff.

<sup>3</sup> e.g. Dial. xciii,2; cx,4; I Apol. lxvii,7.

<sup>4</sup> I Apol. xxxiii,7.

<sup>5</sup> M. Wendland, ΣΩΤΗΡ, Zeitschr. für Neutest. Wissenschaft, (1904), v, 355 ff.

<sup>6</sup> John, iv,42; I John, iv,14: σωτήρ τοῦ κόσμου.



Even though we claim no more about Justin than that his view of the saving work of Christ as effected by the blood of the Cross was superficial, there seems a flatness of the landscape as we view Justin's comments on the Crucifixion and the cults of Eastern gods which saved by the purifying and expiatory grace of sacrificial blood. But Justin, Middle Platonist as he was, would find his Saviour also in the de Mundo of pseudo-Aristotle. We have noted elsewhere a similarity between the image of God in this work and the concept of God in Justin.<sup>1</sup> The God of Heaven and Earth in the de Mundo is *ὁ ὡτὴρ τε καὶ ἑλευθέριος ἐτύμως*.<sup>2</sup> The same author compares the Lord and Governor of the Universe with the Persian Kings: He has his place *ἐπὶ τῆς ἀνωτάτω χώρας, τὴν δὲ δύναμιν διὰ τοῦ ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ κόσμου διήκουσαν ἡλίου τε κινεῖν καὶ βελήνην, καὶ τὸν πάντα οὐρανὸν περιάγειν, αἰτίαν τε γίνεσθαι τοῖς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ὡτηρίας*.<sup>3</sup> This God of the author of de Mundo is not the immanent God of the Stoics, interpenetrating all things, yet remote and impassive; this God maintains the order of the Universe by means of a "power" which intervenes on His behalf.

Maximus of Tyre states in a passage where he is describing the powers which are intermediate between God and man, that God affords salvation to those who are obedient.<sup>4</sup> But the Middle Platonists do not seem to use the term frequently. The Gnostic systems of the period refer to the Saviour with great frequency. The Saviour is said by Irenaeus to have come in the System of Ptolemaeus to that kind of being *τὸ ψυχικόν, ἐπεὶ καὶ αὐτεξούριον ἐστίν, ὅπως αὐτὸ βώβῃ*.<sup>5</sup> Menander claimed to have been sent by the First Power, unknown to all and invisible, as a saviour for the salvation of men.<sup>6</sup> The Saviour in the System of Saturninus appeared as a man in semblance.<sup>7</sup> Hippolytus gives us an account of the Naassenes whose date cannot be fixed with precision. The general tone of

<sup>1</sup>See p. 50.

<sup>2</sup>Ps.-Aristot. de Mundo, 401a 24; cf. 397b 20 (Loeb).

<sup>3</sup>ibid. 398b 8-11.

<sup>4</sup>Max. Tyr. xi, 12 (Hobein).

<sup>5</sup>Irenaeus, adv. Haer. I, 6, 1

<sup>6</sup>ibid. I, 23, 5; cf. I Apol. xxvi, 1, 4.

<sup>7</sup>ibid. I, 24, 2.

their psalms indicate a period towards the middle of the second century A.E.<sup>1</sup> There is considerable biblical exegesis in the Naassene commentary on a Phrygian hymn to Attis. 'Saviour' occurs commonly.<sup>2</sup>

Like Ptolemaeus, Heracleon was a member of the Valentinians. In his commentary on the Gospel of St. John, he uses the term Saviour frequently. For example, to Heracleon, 'The Logos is the Saviour.'<sup>3</sup> Justin's use of Saviour as a title for Christ without the stress of doctrinal content, is not unlike its use in these Gnostic writers of the period.

In summing up this section on Salvation and the Saviour figure, we are moving in the world of apocalyptic. The central figure of the O.T. eschatology, the Davidic Messiah, is absent from the work of Justin and his concept of the Saviour figure looks remarkably like the God or the angel of God who brings salvation and judgement in Gnostic literature in the Asiatic mystery cults and in the Hellenistic descriptions of great men. Where a world view is concerned and where apocalyptic judgement are concerned, a national, earthly king is a meaningless concept. His place is taken by the pre-existent, transcendent Redeemer and Judge, a being like the Son of Man of the Apocalypses. In Justin, the concept of a Saviour does not add a great deal to the figure of Christ. This is not surprising since we found it difficult to find references to the Middle Platonist Logos who was also Soter. If this title was alien to the Logos, Justin found it less than useful to apply it to his idea of Christ. Where he does use it, it is as a title more or less as it is familiar to the Gnostics and Asiatic mystery devotees.

At the beginning of this section, it was felt that after we had established an identity for Christ, it was necessary to study his functions. A relationship between Father and Son in Christian teaching is not just a static kinship. The functions which each performs especially as they affected the other, illustrate the relationship between them. Christ-Logos was indisputably an agent of God and acted as His agent between

<sup>1</sup>For the date, see A.D. Nock, JHS (1929), 49,115.

<sup>2</sup>e.g. Hippol. Refut. v,8,9-9,6.

<sup>3</sup>Origen, in Joh. vi,20 (ed. Preuschen).



the Godhead and His creation. To this extent, the Logos Christ was a Mediator<sup>1</sup> although Justin does not employ such a title. When Justin comments on the Crucifixion, he has little or nothing to say on the fundamental reasons as to why Christ died. A common conviction has existed that redemption is effected by God in Christ and that it results in a newness of life. This involves God's gracious saving love in Christ for sinners. The relationship of the Redeemer and the Father is the very kernel of the Christian faith. So much is evident in the N.T. But in Justin, we find little which throws light on this intimacy between the Father and the Son in the Christian sense.

Justin has no eschatological view of Christ as Saviour. He is essentially the one who saves as a Teacher. It is by His teaching that men rightly know and worship God.<sup>2</sup> The demons have led astray the race of men.<sup>3</sup> The word of His truth is more light-giving than the rays of the sun and sinks down in the depths of the heart and the mind.<sup>4</sup> But he is indisputably the mediator between God and man. This mediator is an essential element in apocalyptic. But at this point the apocalyptic writings vary very widely in their details. For example, the Son of Man, Messiah, Lord differ as much in their functions as in the use of these titles. It is often difficult to determine whether the apocalyptic mediator has an earthly origin or is an angelic figure.<sup>5</sup> The figure of the apocalyptic mediator always carries emphasis in the Christian writers because of the identity with Christ. In Judaism as in Hellenistic philosophy, the tendency was for God to become more and more remote and man's relationship with the almighty, supreme God became so difficult to sustain in personal terms that a personal mediator was essential. There is absolutely no doubt that Justin thought of the Logos as such a mediating figure.

<sup>1</sup>I Tim. ii,5.

<sup>2</sup>I Apol. xiii,3.

<sup>3</sup>ibid. liv,1.

<sup>4</sup>Dial. cxxi,2.

<sup>5</sup>e.g. Dan. vii,13f.

But it is not a long step from this kind of Apocalyptic to Gnosticism especially if the mediatorial figure took shape as principilaties and powers, in fact as several mediators. The Gnostics saw a difference between the Supreme God and the creator of the World; different beings were involved in creation and redemption; the fashioner of the cosmos was different from the one who offered revelation. The Gentiles who had heard little of Christ dedicated themselves τῷ ἀγεννήτῳ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ.<sup>1</sup> This was a very easy step if they were Middle Platonists by conviction and inclination. '(The Platonists) admit', says Clement of Alexandria, 'that God is One, that he is ἀγέννητος and ἀνώλεθρος.'<sup>2</sup> This is a quotation from Plato (Timaeus 52A). The same statement is found in Parmenides<sup>3</sup> which Clement also quotes.<sup>4</sup> The two words in Plato, ἀγέννητος and ἀνώλεθρος are ideas viewed by mind in contrast to concepts experienced by the senses, although Clement refers them to God.<sup>5</sup>

Further use is made by Justin of Middle Platonist terminology in this context. 'No-one can utter the name of the ineffable (ἄρρητος) God'.<sup>6</sup> This term is used in various systems. It is used by Philo<sup>7</sup> as well as in St. Paul<sup>8</sup>; it is employed by Theophilus<sup>9</sup> and in the Hermetic writings.<sup>10</sup> The word is not actually used by Plato although its use in Albinus<sup>11</sup> seems to be taken from a reference in the Epistles of Plato where God is wholly οὐ ἐγτέον.<sup>12</sup> Celsus employs the term according

<sup>1</sup>I Apol. xlix,5.

<sup>2</sup>Clem. Protrept. vi,68,3; cf. xii,120,2 (ed. Stahlin).

<sup>3</sup>Diels, Frag. der Vorsokr. Parmenides, fr.8,11,3f.

<sup>4</sup>Clem. Strom. v, 14, 112, 2 (Stahlin).

<sup>5</sup>cf. ibid. vi,18, 165, 5.

<sup>6</sup>I Apol. lxi,11.

<sup>7</sup>Philo, de Somn. I,67; de Mut. Nom.15.

<sup>8</sup>II Cor. xii,4.

<sup>9</sup>Theoph. ad Autol. I,3.

<sup>10</sup>Corp. Herm. I,I,31 (ed. Nock).

<sup>11</sup>Albinus, Didask. x,1,3,4 (ed. Hermann).

<sup>12</sup>Plato, Epist. vii,341e.



to Origen.<sup>1</sup> When used by Justin in a formularistic manner e.g. 'No-one can utter the name of the ineffable (ἄρρητος) God ... (but) in the name of Jesus Christ, who was crucified under Pontius Pilate ... he who is illuminated is washed',<sup>2</sup> we have drawn attention above to the exorcistic implications of such formulas.<sup>3</sup>

'Jesus Christ, our Saviour ... having been made flesh (σὰρκα ποιηθεὶς) by the Word of God, had both flesh and blood for our salvation.'<sup>4</sup> Justin may see clearly the significance of the cosmic role of the Logos. But in this passage he does not seem to have solved the problem of the Incarnation. If Jesus Christ was made flesh by or through the Word of God, it is difficult to escape from a position of subordinationism. Hitherto we have been convinced that the cosmological function of Logos as the Son of God has been so dominant that Justin makes it the reason for the title 'Christ'.<sup>5</sup> For this reason the Son of the true God is 'in second place' (ἐν δευτέρᾳ ἁρίτι)<sup>6</sup> and as Justin himself mentions,<sup>7</sup> he is drawing for this idea on Plato himself. The phrase πρῶτος Θεός in this context Justin derives even more specifically from Albinus<sup>8</sup> and Numenius.<sup>9</sup> The Son of God too as a cosmological power is compared by Justin with the world soul of the Timaeus.<sup>10</sup> The main themes of the cosmology of Sonship derive from Middle Platonism. But if Justin cannot see the actual incarnation in terms more related to this cosmology and if he really means that Jesus Christ was made flesh by the Word, not only are we moving in subordinationist circles, but there are elements of Gnosticism, exorcism and magic attached to much of what he says. The Word has not

<sup>1</sup> Orig. con. Cels. vii,42 (ed. Koetschau) For the namelessness of God, see Origen, ibid. vi,65.

<sup>2</sup> I Apol. lxi,11-13.

<sup>3</sup> See p. 132 ff.

<sup>4</sup> I Apol. lxvi,2.

<sup>5</sup> II Apol. v(vi),3.

<sup>6</sup> I Apol. xiii,3.

<sup>7</sup> I Apol. lx,7.

<sup>8</sup> Albinus, Didask. x,2-3 (ed. Hermann).

<sup>9</sup> Numen. Frag. 11,11 (= Euseb. Praep. Evang. xi,17,11-18); 12,1-3 (ed. E. des Places).

<sup>10</sup> I Apol. lx,1-7.

possessed from all eternity a separate existence whether personal or not distinguished from that of the Father. The Son was begotten by the Father (ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ).<sup>1</sup> When the Son was begotten, the λογικὴ δυνάμις, becoming an entity with its own existence, this was by the will of the Father to create the cosmos.<sup>2</sup> But the crucified Jesus Christ was not of this order. 'We see and are persuaded that men approach God ... through the name of Him who was crucified, Jesus Christ ... He is the new Law and the new Covenant.'<sup>3</sup> These references to the approach to the Father through the name of Christ are numerous. Viewed in this light, these references may not be entirely free from Gnostic elements. 'We beseech God by Jesus Christ to preserve us from the demons which are hostile to the worship of God ... in order that after our conversion by Him to God, we may be blameless. For we call Him Helper and Redeemer, the power of whose name even the demons fear; and at this day, when they are exorcised in the name of Jesus Christ, crucified under Pontius Pilate ... they are overcome. And thus it is manifest to all that His Father has given Him so great power, by virtue of which demons are subdued to His name.'<sup>4</sup> Gnosticism, magic, exorcism - all these elements are not distant from such passages.

In Gnostic circles, exemplified by Basilides, the non-existent God is the Great Ruler. He existed in the Ogdoad.<sup>5</sup> The King and lord of the universe was the Great Ruler. But there was also a King and lord over this region, the Hebdomad. It was the ruler of the Hebdomad who was the Son of the Great Ruler. It was the ruler of the Hebdomad who spoke to Moses, 'I am the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob' (Exod. vi, 2).<sup>6</sup> Justin thought the author of these words was Christ<sup>7</sup> and he too saw Christ as the Everlasting King according to his interpretation of Psalms, lxxii.<sup>8</sup> In the system of Basilides, the God of the Ogdoad is ὁ ἀρχὴν τοῦ κόσμου just as is the unbegotten, unutterable (ἄρρητος) God of Justin.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Dial. lxi, 1.

<sup>2</sup> cf. II Apol. (v) vi, 3; Dial. lxi, 4.

<sup>3</sup> Dial. xi, 4.

<sup>4</sup> Dial. xxx, 3.

<sup>5</sup> Hippol. Refut. vii, 23, 7; cf. ibid. vii, 25, 3 where the Great Ruler is the Ogdoad.

<sup>6</sup> ibid. vii, 25, 4.

<sup>7</sup> Dial. cxxvi, 5.

<sup>8</sup> Dial. xxxiv, 2.

<sup>9</sup> Hippol. Refut. vii, 25, 4; cf. Justin, Dial. cxxvi, 2.



This unutterable God takes precedence over the Logos than whom βασιλικώτατον ... ἄρχοντα μετὰ τὸν γεννήσαντα θεὸν οὐδένα οἶδμεν ὄντα.<sup>1</sup> The Christ-Logos is again given royal status here. But in this reference the description is applied to Logos as ἄρχων. The chapter is innocent enough if Justin is simply comparing good and bad princes.<sup>2</sup> It is applied to Jesus once only in the N.T.<sup>3</sup> Elsewhere it is the name par excellence of the prince of darkness<sup>4</sup> and 'the rulers of this world'.<sup>5</sup> At this point, we drew attention to the second Lord, the Hebdomad, who was the son of the great ruler. We further note in this connection where the Logos is described as a most royal Archon by Justin that Irenaeus also describes the Hebdomad as Archon.<sup>6</sup> The second God of Basilides, the God of the Jews was also an Archon.<sup>7</sup> Justin believed that it was the Logos-Christ who spoke with Moses<sup>8</sup> and Hippolytus knew this person as an Archon of the Hebdomad: ὁ ἑβδομάδος ἄρχων ὁ λαλήσας τῷ Μωϋσῇ.<sup>9</sup> Justin describes this person as: καὶ ἐλάλησε Μωϋσεὶ ἄγγελος θεοῦ.<sup>10</sup> In the system of Saturninus, Irenaeus tells us τὸν τῶν Ἰουδαίων θεὸν ἓνα τῶν ἀγγέλων εἶναί φησι.<sup>11</sup> Clement in the Excerpta ex Theodoto claims that Jesus is an angel of the Pleroma.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>1</sup> I Apol. xii,7; cf. Dial. cxxvi-cxxviii.

<sup>2</sup> cf. I Apol. xii,4.

<sup>3</sup> Rev. i,5.

<sup>4</sup> Matt. ix,34; xii,24; Mk. iii,22; Luke, xi,15; John, xii,31; xiv,30; xvi,11; Eph. ii,2.

<sup>5</sup> I. Cor. ii,6,8.

<sup>6</sup> Iren. Haer. I,xxv,2.

<sup>7</sup> Clem. Strom. ii,8,1 (Stählin).

<sup>8</sup> I Apol. lxiii.

<sup>9</sup> Hippol. Refut. vii,25. cf. Iren. Haer. I,24,4f.

<sup>10</sup> I Apol. lxiii,7; Dial. lix.

<sup>11</sup> Iren. Haer. I,24,2

<sup>12</sup> Clem. Exc. Theod. 35, 1 (Stählin).

In the Apocryphal writings of the N.T. Christ sometimes appears as an angel.<sup>1</sup> In the Epistula Apostolorum, possibly dated to the second half of the second century A.D., the Lord passed by the angels and archangels in their form and as one of them.<sup>2</sup> In a fragment of the Gospel of the Ebionites, Epiphanius claims: 'they say that he (Christ) was not begotten of God the Father, but created as one of the archangels'.<sup>3</sup> Simon Peter in the Gospel of Thomas likened Jesus to a righteous angel.<sup>4</sup> In the Gospel of the Ebionites Christ was created as one of the archangels and he rules over the angels and all the creatures of the Almighty.<sup>5</sup> The gnosticism in these authors is not in doubt. Origen also gives Christ an angelic presentation in several passages.<sup>6</sup> Philo gives to the Logos the rank of τὸν ἀγγέλων πρεβύτατον, ὡς ἂν ἀρχάγγελον.<sup>7</sup>

The text of Psalms, cx,1 is quoted by Justin as a proof text of the existence of the second God: 'The Lord says to my Lord, sit on my right hand ...' In the same way, the beauty of the Son appeared to the Great Ruler who made Him sit on the right, according to the gnostic beliefs recorded in Hippolytus.<sup>8</sup> There is considerable evidence to show that Justin either shared a common stock of ideas with the gnostics or that he was influenced by them. But certainly the Logos-Christ as Mediator between the unknowable God and creation was viewed as a royal mediator and he was envisaged as an angel as we have seen. 'For Christ is King and Priest and God and Lord and Ἄγγελος and Ἄνθρωπος and Ἀρχιστράτηγος and stone and a Son born and παθητὸς γενόμενος πρῶτον, εἶτα εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀνερχόμενος καὶ πάλιν παραγινόμενος μετὰ δόξης καὶ αἰώνιον τὴν βασιλείαν ἔχων'.<sup>9</sup> In view of what we have claimed above concerning Gnostic use

<sup>1</sup>For angelology in Justin, see further pp. 102-113.

<sup>2</sup>E. Hennecke, (Eng.trans.). N.T. Apocrypha, I,p.198.

<sup>3</sup>Epiph. Haer. 30,16,4.

<sup>4</sup>Gospel of Thomas, Log. 82,32-34 (ed. Guillaumont).

<sup>5</sup>Gospel of the Ebionites ap. Epiph. Haer. 30,16,4.

<sup>6</sup>e.g. Origen, in John.19,6; ibid. i,31: ὁ ... ὡτὴρ ... γέγονεν ἀνθρώποις ἄνθρωπος καὶ ἀγγέλοις ἄγγελος (ed. Preuschen).

<sup>7</sup>Philo, Conf. 146.

<sup>8</sup>Hippol. Refut. vii,23,6; cf. Dial. lvi,14.

<sup>9</sup>Dial. xxxiv,2.



of regal or ruling terms being applied to an angelomorphic Logos-Christ, the juxtaposition of terms like "Ἀγγελος", "Ἀγγελωπιος" and "Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος" needs comment, especially when they occur in a context with βασιλεὺς and τὴν βασιλείαν ἔχων. A similar expression occurs in another passage: 'this same One who is both Angel and God and Lord and Ἀνγέ and Ἀγγελωπιος ... appeared in a flame of fire ... and conversed with Moses'.<sup>1</sup> The use of Ἀνγέ with Ἀγγελωπιος demonstrates beyond doubt that Justin does not mean anything anthropomorphic. Doubt might be expressed in similar passages elsewhere,<sup>2</sup> but not here.

The use of this substantive in such a context is thoroughly Gnostic. In his account of the Sethian-Ophites, Irenaeus uses the substantive in a genealogy.<sup>3</sup> The First Man, Perfect Man, Pre-existent Man are all variants of 'the Man'. In classical myth, the human race was descended from an aboriginal being, both female and male, Anthropos. Plato offers an account of the origin and nature of this being, although the primitive myth reaches back to the prehistory of Babylonia and Sumeria.<sup>4</sup> Irenaeus comments on the teaching of Mark the Magician<sup>5</sup> who held the same views as found in Ptolemaeus' Exegesis on John. Mark makes Anthropos and Ecclesia a syzygy of the Ogdoad where the Power of the most High corresponds to Anthropos.<sup>6</sup> Ptolemaeus taught that Church and Anthropos had the same meaning, both coming from Logos and Life.<sup>7</sup> Perhaps the author of II Clement adapted the myth of Anthropos to account for his view of the pre-existent Church.<sup>8</sup> Perhaps the same idea is taken up in the Epistle to the Ephesians: 'He (God) gave him (Christ) to be the head over all things to the Church, which is his body (σῶμα)'.<sup>9</sup> In their

<sup>1</sup> ibid. lix,1.

<sup>2</sup> I Apol. lxiii,10; Dial. liv,2.

<sup>3</sup> Iren. Haer. I,30,1

<sup>4</sup> Plato, Symp. 189-192.

<sup>5</sup> Iren. Haer. I,14,5

<sup>6</sup> ibid. I,15,3.

<sup>7</sup> ibid. I,8,5.

<sup>8</sup> II Clem. xiv,1f.

<sup>9</sup> Eph. i,22-23.

teachings, the Naassenes, according to the account of Hippolytus, 'reverence beyond all others Man and the Son of Man. Now this Man ... is called by them Adamas ... and the hymns ... are worded by them ... as this: From thee, Father, and through thee, Mother, the two immortal names, parents of the Aeons, thou citizen of heaven, Anthropos of the mighty name.' <sup>1</sup> The Platonist theory of ideas may have influenced this concept whereby the highest metaphysical entity was identified with the "idea" of the highest material entity. The Babylonians believed that a first divine man named Oannes, sprang from among them and the same Naassene account in Hippolytus claimed that the Assyrians in worshipping Oannes were actually worshipping Anthropos. <sup>2</sup>

The Chaldaeans spoke of Oannes as Adam. <sup>3</sup> 'For there is one blessed nature of the blessed Man above, Adamas', was also a tenet of the Naassenes. <sup>4</sup> Writing more than two centuries later than Justin, Epiphanius describes earlier gnostic thinking, possibly of Valentinus; he postulates a union between the Greatness, indestructible Nous, and within Him Ennoia; from this union was produced the Father of Truth whom the perfect ones rightly call Man. <sup>5</sup> He refers to a belief of the Ebionites: *ΤΙΝΕΣ γὰρ ἔξ αὐτῶν καὶ Ἀνθρωπον τὸν Χριστὸν εἶναι λέγουσιν*. <sup>6</sup> In linking Christ with Anthropos, Justin would seem to be expressing something of an Ebionite belief. Methodius takes a similar view, although he is also later than Justin. <sup>7</sup> Irenaeus gives us the Ophites' belief in the Father of all who is called the First Anthropos and Son of the one who emits him, the Son of Man, the Second Man. <sup>8</sup>

The royal mediator Christ-Logos was named Anthropos by Justin. Based on the associations with and the connotations of the use of the term Anthropos by the Gnostics, the conclusion must be that his concept of the royal mediator was tinged with Gnosticism. The catalogue of names for Christ in the passage under scrutiny <sup>9</sup> is also reminiscent of Gnostic

<sup>1</sup> Hippol. Refut. v,6,4-5.

<sup>2</sup> ibid. v,7,6.

<sup>3</sup> ibid.

<sup>4</sup> id. Refut. v,8,2.

<sup>5</sup> Epiph. Haer. xxxi,5,1-5.

<sup>6</sup> id. xxx,3.

<sup>7</sup> Method. Symp. 3,4 (Migne).

<sup>8</sup> Iren. Haer. I,30,1; cf. I,30,6

<sup>9</sup> Dial. xxxiv,2; lix,1.



genealogies and synonymous titles.

The term ἀρχιεπίσκοπος applied to Christ in the former of the two passages must also be taken in context.<sup>1</sup> Justin uses the word only three times viz. twice when he refers to the Captain of the Lord's Host who spoke to Joshua<sup>2</sup> and in the passage already referred to above.<sup>3</sup> Justin might be simply using the LXX word to describe yet another epiphany of the Christ Logos. The word is employed a score of times in the LXX usually to refer to a military leader without any apocalyptic or celestial connotations. But it is not used in the N.T. in its military sense or in a metaphorical sense.

Christ in later writers than Justin possessed this title as chief captain of the host.<sup>4</sup> But it was also applied to Michael as chief captain of the host of heaven.<sup>5</sup> In this capacity he mediates between God and man to receive the prayers of the latter.<sup>6</sup> In the Epistula Apostolorum, possibly dating to the second century A.D. Michael appears as chief leader of the angels.<sup>7</sup> J. Barbel cites other instances of the application of the title ἀρχιεπίσκοπος to Michael.<sup>8</sup> J. Daniélou has shown that in Hermas, Christ is identified with Michael where the angel of the Lord is the Word (Hermas viii,3,3).<sup>9</sup> We have noticed above that in the

<sup>1</sup> Dial. xxxiv,2.

<sup>2</sup> Jos. v,13; Dial. lxi,1; lxii,5.

<sup>3</sup> Dial. xxxiv,2.

<sup>4</sup> e.g. Method. Symp. 3,6 (Migne); Eus. Prep. Evang. 7,15 (Migne); de Laud. Const. 3 (Migne); Hist. Eccles. I,2,3; ibid. 1,2,11 (Loeb).

<sup>5</sup> e.g. Test. Abraham, A,1,9 passim (ed. Charles); III Baruch, 11,4 (ed. James).

<sup>6</sup> III Baruch, 11,4.

<sup>7</sup> E. Hennecke, N.T. Apocrypha, I,198 (Eng.trans.).

<sup>8</sup> J. Barbel, Christos Angelos, p.227.

<sup>9</sup> J. Daniélou, A History of Early Christian Doctrine, I,123 f.

Gospel of Thomas<sup>1</sup> there is an indication that angelomorphic christology was a prominent concept in early Christian circles of the second century.<sup>2</sup> Justin was influenced by the idea of a mediator given angelic functions and substance in gnostic circles. His application of the titles Ἄγγελος, Ἀνγερονος and Ἀρχιερεῖς to the Christ-Logos, if they do not mark Justin as a thorough-going gnostic, at least would indicate that the well from which he drank drew its water from many sources, one of which would have been gnostic. Where God has moved into a remote sublimity and where as a consequence man's immediate devotion to God has become so enfeebled that he needs intermediaries of one kind or another,<sup>3</sup> apocalyptic takes a short step into proximity with gnosticism. It is no surprise therefore that Justin applies the words ἄρχοντα βασιλικώτατον to the Word.<sup>4</sup> Archon is a word used constantly by the Gnostics of intermediaries and celestial powers of all kinds. It is not used of Christ in the N.T. although it is used of the Devil,<sup>5</sup> the archon of the cosmos<sup>6</sup> and the prince of the power of the air.<sup>7</sup> This most royal archon in Justin is the Mediator who will help God. Clement refers the title archon to the Logos in the Stromateis.<sup>8</sup> Carpocrates applies the word to the Hebdomad<sup>9</sup> and we have noted above the connection between the Hebdomad and the King and ruler of this universe who was the Son of the Great Ruler.<sup>10</sup> The non-existent God in the system of Basilides

<sup>1</sup> Gospel of Thomas, Log. 13, 82, 34 (ed. Guillaumont).

<sup>2</sup> See p. 102.

<sup>3</sup> It is not proposed to discuss at this point whether a human or angelic mediator is essential to apocalyptic eschatology. For a brief, but excellent discussion, see K. Koch, The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic, pp. 135-136.

<sup>4</sup> I Apol. xii, 7.

<sup>5</sup> Matt. ix, 34; xii, 24; Mark, iii, 22; Luke, xi, 15.

<sup>6</sup> John, xii, 31; xiv, 30; xvi, 11.

<sup>7</sup> Ephes. ii, 2.

<sup>8</sup> Clem. Strom. vii, 16.

<sup>9</sup> Iren. Haer. i, 25, 2

<sup>10</sup> See p. 143.



established a mixture of seeds and the second Archon, also ineffable, whose place was the Hebdomad arose from the seeds.<sup>1</sup> If Justin was giving expression to these various strands of ideas, he was being only a shade less positive than the idea which one can hear in the cry of the First Woman-Mother in the system of the Sethian-Ophites: 'Do not speak falsely; above you are the Father of All, the First Man and the Man who is the Son of Man.'<sup>2</sup> Throughout the works of Justin, Christ is the Mediator; Justin sees that He has royal functions as a King<sup>3</sup> and that in the second advent, in the words of Daniel, power and royal honour are given to Him.<sup>4</sup> Justin is quite at home in this apocalyptic thinking which explains the course of history and tells of the end of the world.

We might be able to throw further light on the relationship between the Father and Son if we study the significance of 'glory'. This is the term which is used to describe the 'brightness' which in O.T. and N.T. literature is manifested in a theophany, angelophany or Christophany. As we shall note below passim, 'glory' is a symbol both of a perfected human nature and of divine perfection as seen by human eyes. If we can see the nature of glory manifested by or in and around Christ and if we can see where it originated whether as belonging absolutely to Christ or shed on Him by the Father, we might be able to make clearer statements about the relationship of the Son to the Father.

The sequence of apocalyptic events terminates in glory. The final condition of all affairs of the just anticipates glory. The wise will shine as the brightness of the firmament.<sup>5</sup> In those days a change shall take place for the holy and elect and the light of days shall abide upon them and glory shall turn to the holy.<sup>6</sup> The faces of the angels in heaven shall be lighted up with joy.<sup>7</sup> Glory is the condition in which men and

<sup>1</sup> Hippol. Refut. xxiv,3.

<sup>2</sup> Iren. Haer. I,30,6

<sup>3</sup> e.g. Dial. xxxiv,2.

<sup>4</sup> ibid. xxxi,4.

<sup>5</sup> Dan. xii,3.

<sup>6</sup> I Enoch, 50,1 (ed. Charles).

<sup>7</sup> ibid. 51,4.

angels will live in the heavenly place of the future.<sup>1</sup> Justin believes that Christ in his second advent will come from heaven μετὰ δόξης accompanied by His angelic host.<sup>2</sup> Justin says: 'Behold, as the Son of Man He cometh in the clouds of heaven, and His angels with Him.'<sup>3</sup> Justin ascribes these words specifically to Jeremiah; but the nearest parallel is Daniel, vii,13. The events accompanying Christ's glorious advent are described by Justin in the words of Daniel.<sup>4</sup> Justin is quite at home as he moves in the ideas of the apocalyptic writers.<sup>5</sup> At the Parousia, the resurrection of the saints takes place and the new Jerusalem becomes the inheritance of Christians.<sup>6</sup>

The term 'glory' is used very frequently in the apocalyptic writings in connection with the juncture of the earthly and heavenly at the end of time. In the N.T. δόξα is used often in association with βασιλεία and δύναμις<sup>7</sup> although this is not the case in Justin. In St. John too, both in the Gospel and Epistles, δύναμις is absent.<sup>8</sup> δόξα translates תִּלְךָ in the LXX and although δόξα has other meanings, its particular usage for the present study, as suggested above, is the sense of the visible brightness of the divine presence.<sup>9</sup> After O.T. times, the rabbinical writers spoke of the glory or 'visible brightness of the presence' of God as the תִּלְךָ and although this word does not appear in the O.T. it is frequent in the Targums either as a periphrasis or a hypostasis of God, like memra or yekara.<sup>10</sup> The idea

<sup>1</sup> Rev. xxi,1ff.

<sup>2</sup> I Apol. lii,3.

<sup>3</sup> I Apol. li,9.

<sup>4</sup> Dial. xxxi,1 = Daniel, vii,9-28.

<sup>5</sup> e.g. Dial. xxxiv,1-2; xxxvi; xlix,2; xlix,4-5; cxx,4.

<sup>6</sup> Dial. cxiii,3-5.

<sup>7</sup> e.g. Matt. vi,13; Mark, xiii,26.

<sup>8</sup> See p. 154.

<sup>9</sup> For an excellent summary, see A. Richardson, An Introduction to the Theology of the N.T., pp.64-67.

<sup>10</sup> See G.F. Moore, 'Intermediaries in Jewish Theology', Harvard Theological Review, xv(1922), pp.41-61.



of δόξα, 'glory' in the N.T. was influenced at many points by this later Jewish imagining of the shekhinah as God's visible, glorious dwelling in Israel.<sup>1</sup> The final and complete unveiling of the δόξα must await the parousia. Jesus had referred to his own coming 'in the δόξα of his Father'<sup>2</sup> and of his 'coming in clouds with great δύναντις and δόξα'.<sup>3</sup> Jesus uses the traditional language of Jewish apocalyptic to express the truths about His final coming to fulfil the completed mission to the world.<sup>4</sup> The parousia will be the revelation of Christ's δόξα.<sup>5</sup>

L.H. Brockington discussed four ways in which doxa was used in the N.T. under the influence of the LXX.<sup>6</sup> One of these uses defined the power and wonder-working activity of God. Jesus is conceived as transmitting divine doxa to his disciples as a power which will make a unity of them even as it made Him a unity with God.<sup>7</sup> As the Spirit transforms the faithful and causes them to become at unity with the glory of the Lord, so they are incorporated within the βασιλεία of God. Justin uses the term doxa in an anaemic way. Middle Platonist as he undoubtedly was, he does not seize upon the imaginative and vivid connotations of the term either as seen in later Jewish writers or in his contemporaries among the patristic writers. We have noted above that Justin does not link δόξα with the δύναντις of God or the βασιλεία of God as does for example the Lord's Prayer. δύναντις has strong Aristotelian connections which would be familiar to Middle Platonist thinkers and Theophilus is fully alive to this

<sup>1</sup> A. Richardson, ibid.

<sup>2</sup> Mark, viii, 38.

<sup>3</sup> Mark, xiii, 26.

<sup>4</sup> cf. Dan. vii, 13f; Zech. xiv, 5f; Matt. xxiv, 30; xxv, 31; xxvi, 64; John, i, 51; Acts, i, 11; I Thess. iv, 16; Rev. i, 7.

<sup>5</sup> I Pet. i, 7; iv, 13.

<sup>6</sup> L.H. Brockington, 'The Septuagintal Background to the N.T. use of "doxa"', Studies in the Gospels (1955), 3ff. See also A.W. Argyle, God in the N.T. p. 28.

<sup>7</sup> John, xvii, 22.

significance. We shall need to discuss this below. Justin added little to the concept of βασιλεία since he saw this as a heavenly version of an earthly, human kingdom.<sup>1</sup> Theophilus of Antioch identified δόξα with βασιλεία.<sup>2</sup> Basileia is a familiar O.T. concept and the term is used of God's Kingdom as early as pre-Sinai times and it is enshrined in the Creation stories of Genesis where a theocratic order is obvious. This Kingdom of God is revealed by Christ in the N.T. Justin is content to accept the term with a limited figurative connotation and he has little to say of it eschatologically except that it is everlasting. 'For Christ is King ... and returning to heaven ... He is preached as having the everlasting Basileia.'<sup>3</sup> Justin seems to have brought to the term something of the Hellenistic sense of βασιλεύς. In the Stoa, βασιλεύς had a religious and cosmic connotation. When the term carried this connotation, the mortal king was a copy of Zeus-Basileus,<sup>4</sup> ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ἄριστος θεός.<sup>5</sup> Maximus of Tyre described the one God as πάντων βασιλεύς καὶ πατήρ.<sup>6</sup> Numenius postulated the existence of two Gods<sup>7</sup> and claimed that the first God was ἀργὸν ἔργων ὑμῖν πάντων καὶ βασιλέα.<sup>8</sup> The neo-Platonists continued to accept the same idea e.g. in Plotinus: ἐφ' ἅπασιν δὲ τοῦτοις βασιλεύς προφαίνεται ἐξαίφνης αὐτὸς ὁ μέγας.<sup>9</sup> Philo did not favour the word in an eschatological sense<sup>10</sup> and he owes his concept of a divine king to Stoicism.<sup>11</sup> He refers to ὁ ποιμὴν καὶ βασιλεύς θεός who guides the celestial bodies and all living things κατὰ δίκην καὶ νόμον.<sup>12</sup> Similar Stoic

<sup>1</sup> I Apol. xi,1,2.

<sup>2</sup> Theoph. ad Autol. i,3: βασιλείαν εἰπὼν, δόξαν αὐτοῦ λέγω.

<sup>3</sup> Dial. xxxiv,2.

<sup>4</sup> See C.J. de Vogel, Greek Philosophy, iii, p.163.

<sup>5</sup> e.g. Dio Chrys. Or. iii,50 (Migne).

<sup>6</sup> Max. Tyr. xi,5a (ed. Hobein).

<sup>7</sup> Num. Frag. 11,3-4 (ed. Places) = Euseb. Praep. Evang. xi,17,536D.

<sup>8</sup> id. Frag. 12,13 (ed. Places) = Euseb. loc. cit. 537C.

<sup>9</sup> Plot. Enn. v,5,3.

<sup>10</sup> See Bible Key Words, 'Basileia', ed. K.L. Schmidt et al. (G. Kittel, T.N.N.T. p.25).

<sup>11</sup> e.g. Philo, de Abr. 261.

<sup>12</sup> e.g. id. de Agricult. 51.



influences are at work in such passages as IV Macc. xiv,2: 'O reasoning minds, more kingly than kings' for the Stoic thinkers held that the wise man alone was king. The thought is repeated in Diogenes Laertius: οὐ μόνον δ' ἐλευθέρους εἶναι τοὺς σοφοὺς ἀλλὰ καὶ βασιλέας, τῆς βασιλείας οὐδὲς ἀρχῆς ἀνυπεύθυνου.<sup>1</sup> The theme is enshrined in the words of Stobaeus: μόνον εἶναι τὸν σοφὸν βασιλέα καὶ βασιλικόν.<sup>2</sup> There is nothing of this Hellenism in Justin. Indeed, there is little in Justin's concept of the 'Kingdom of God' which would make much sense to a Greek. The Kingship of a deity was a different concept from deification of a King. The former idea was Semitic, the latter well-known to Greeks.<sup>3</sup> We have seen above how much of Justin's concept of God was couched in terms which were applicable to an oriental despot. But both Semite and Greek might come to accord with the idea of a new world age. The Greek was quite familiar with the idea of a new world-age co-terminous with the present. Justin had no need to reject this concept. Seneca, for example, could refer to anno novo initio saeculi felicissimi at the accession of Caligula.<sup>4</sup> But the Jews saw the new age as being anticipated by a Messianic victory here on earth.<sup>5</sup> Justin envisages not a Messianic victory as such, but the establishing of an everlasting Kingdom, given to Christ by God at Christ's parousia. The nature of this Kingdom is not described by Justin. He employs the apocalyptic of Daniel in which to incorporate mention of the everlasting Kingdom.<sup>6</sup> Justin says that Christ put an end to the prophesying and baptizing of John and preached also that the Kingdom of heaven is at hand.<sup>7</sup> He quotes the words of our Lord about the Kingdom of heaven,<sup>8</sup> one of his quotations approximating to John, iii,5.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Diog. Laert. vii,122 (Loeb).

<sup>2</sup> Stob. Eth. ii,222 (ed. Heeren).

<sup>3</sup> cf. Theoph. ad Autol. ii,2; iii,7.

<sup>4</sup> Seneca, de Mort. Claud. i,1.

<sup>5</sup> e.g. II Baruch, 36-40 (ed. Charles).

<sup>6</sup> e.g. Dial. xxxi,4,6,7; lxxvi,1; cxl,2.

<sup>7</sup> Dial. li,2,3.

<sup>8</sup> Dial. cv,6 = Matt. v,20; I Apol. xv,4 = Matt. xix,12.

<sup>9</sup> Apol. lxi,4.

Justin anticipates nothing of Clement of Alexandria's Stoic gloss on Christ the King where those who belong to Christ the King are Kings. Clement quotes Speusippus with approval: 'for if royalty be a good thing, and the wise man the only king and ruler, the law which is right reason is good.'<sup>1</sup> Clement also expounds: 'Abandon the alien possessions that are in your soul that, becoming pure in heart, you may see God; which is another way of saying, 'Enter into the Kingdom of heaven.'<sup>2</sup> The rather bald references of Justin to the Kingdom of heaven are less vivid compared with the more eschatological content of references in other writers.<sup>3</sup> Irenaeus identified the Kingdom with  $\phi\omega\varsigma$  and union with God through faith.<sup>4</sup> Justin does not venture from the idea that at the general resurrection, the Kingdom of God will be established by and for Christ.<sup>5</sup> Justin nowhere links  $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha$  with  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ . Yet this link is a very common one as we saw in Theophilus.<sup>6</sup> According to the Matthaean version of the Temptations, Jesus was shown all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them.<sup>7</sup> The variant manuscripts of Matt. vi,13 add to the Lord's Prayer a doxology: 'for thine is the  $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha$  and the  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  and the  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ .'<sup>8</sup> There would appear at first sight to be a natural connection between all three elements where royalty would be concerned. Justin apparently did not think so or if he did, he did not employ such a figurative connection. St. Paul rarely refers to the basileia of Christ; he usually has in mind a basileia of God.<sup>9</sup> Where St. Paul thinks of a basileia of Christ, he thinks of it as having actually been established.<sup>10</sup> Justin does not follow Pauline thinking since to St. Paul Christ was the first-fruits and at the end, he will have delivered up the Basileia to God.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Clem. Strom. ii,4,18-19 (Stählin).

<sup>2</sup>id. quis div. 19 (Loeb).

<sup>3</sup>e.g. I Clement, 1,3; II Clem. v,5; M. Polyc. xx,2.

<sup>4</sup>Iren. Haer. v,28,1

<sup>5</sup>I Apol. xi,1,2; Dial. cxvii,3.

<sup>6</sup>See p. 152.

<sup>7</sup>Matt. iv,8; Luke, iv,5-6.

<sup>8</sup>cf. Didache, (viii,2); ix,4; x,5.

<sup>9</sup>e.g. II Thess. i,4-5; Gal. v,21; I Cor. vi,9-10; xv,50; Col. iv,11; cf. I Thess. ii,12 where basileia is linked with doxa.

<sup>10</sup>Col. i,12-13.

<sup>11</sup>I Cor. xv,23-28.



'Glory' and 'kingdom' are frequently linked in the N.T. When Jesus reproved James and John, Mark uses the expression  $\epsilon\nu\ \tau\eta\ \delta\acute{o}\xi\eta\ \sigma\omicron\upsilon$ <sup>1</sup> where the Matthaean parallel has  $\epsilon\nu\ \tau\eta\ \beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\ \sigma\omicron\upsilon$ .<sup>2</sup> The writer in I Enoch describes the archangels as addressing God as 'Lord of Lords, God of gods, King of kings, the throne of thy glory ( $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ ) standeth'.<sup>3</sup> The Didache links them too:  $\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega\ \sigma\upsilon\nu\alpha\chi\theta\eta\tau\omega\ \sigma\omicron\upsilon\ \eta\ \epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\acute{\alpha}\ \dots\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\eta\nu\ \sigma\eta\nu\ \beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu.\ \omicron\tau\iota\ \sigma\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu\ \eta\ \delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha\ \kappa\tau\lambda$ .<sup>4</sup> The author of I Clement prays to God who gave to Christians  $\tau\eta\nu\ \epsilon\chi\sigma\upsilon\sigma\iota\acute{\alpha}\nu\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$  that they might know the  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  given to them by God.<sup>5</sup> The author of II Clement says that unbelievers will see the  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  of God and will be amazed when they see  $\tau\omicron\ \beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\iota\omicron\nu\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\omicron\sigma\mu\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\nu\ \tau\omega\ \text{'}\text{I}\eta\sigma\omicron\upsilon$ .<sup>6</sup> There is no apocalyptic glory attached to the future kingdom of Christ after His parousia, as far as Justin referred to it. Justin held a literal view of what was to be established in the millennium. God's kingdom would be given to Christ<sup>7</sup>, but the holy people of the Most High would receive it with Him.<sup>8</sup>

The final state of the world at the parousia is described by Justin in the words of Daniel, vii, 9-28.<sup>9</sup> Christ will come at that time with or in glory.<sup>10</sup> But this glory is thought by Justin to be God's glory<sup>11</sup> and God gives His glory to Christ alone.<sup>12</sup> Justin refers frequently to Christ's second coming and distinguishes it quite clearly from the first. The author of the Muratorian fragment which is approximately contemporary with Justin has the same contrast between the humility of the first coming and the glory of the second: ao de gemino eius adventu primo in

<sup>1</sup> Mark, x, 37.

<sup>2</sup> Matt. xx, 21.

<sup>3</sup> I Enoch, ix, 4 (ed. Charles).

<sup>4</sup> Did. ix, 4; cf. x, 5.

<sup>5</sup> I Clem. lxi, 1.

<sup>6</sup> II Clem. xvii, 5.

<sup>7</sup> Dial. xlvi, 1; cf. xxxii, 1; xxxix, 7; lxxix, 2.

<sup>8</sup> Dial. xxxi, 4, 6, 7; cf. Dial. lxxvi, 1; cxl, 2.

<sup>9</sup> e.g. Dial. xxxi.

<sup>10</sup> e.g. Dial. xiv, 8; xxxiv, 2; xxxvi, 1; xxxix, 7; xlix, 3; cx, 2;

I Apol. l, 1; lii, 3.

<sup>11</sup> e.g. Dial. xlii, 1; lxviii, 5.

<sup>12</sup> Dial. lxx, 3 (quoting Isaiah, xlii, 5-13).

humilitate despectus quod fu <sup>1</sup> it secundum potestatem regalis patris,  
prae-clarum quod futurum est. The eschatology of the N.T. demonstrates  
a full range of concepts of the parousia in terms of the present and  
the future. In the teachings of our Lord and in St. Paul, the varying  
emphasis is fully evident. St. John too concentrates on one point of  
fulfilment that the parousia is already at hand. Revelation on the  
other hand looks keenly to the future. But for Justin the second coming  
of Christ will be an event in history and nothing of the present time  
will obstruct the anticipation of this future event.<sup>2</sup> 'Your people will  
see and recognize Him whom they pierced as Hosea and Daniel foretold',  
says Justin.<sup>3</sup>

Glory is something which is attached to Christ by God. Glory belongs  
to God and He gives it to Christ alone.<sup>4</sup> We have seen above that  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$   
does duty for Shekhinah. Whether this Shekhinah is a periphrasis or a  
hypostasis of God, nothing in Justin would rebut a view that it is this  
Shekhinah, the visible brightness of God's presence, which is to be given  
to Christ at the parousia. It is the Shekhinah with which Christ comes.  
Here lies the reason why Justin does not link doxa with Basileia since  
doxa is not the magnificence attached to a kingdom no matter how exalted  
that kingdom is. Doxa is something of God's presence. In this way, Justin  
can cry to Trypho: 'Let us glorify God ... let us glorify Him by the  
King of glory, by the Lord of hosts'<sup>5</sup> 'Who is this King of Glory?' Justin  
rhetorically asks. 'And the Holy Spirit, either from the person of His  
Father or from His own person, answers, 'The Lord of Hosts, He is this  
King of Glory.'<sup>6</sup> But Justin envisages doxa to be more than a radiant  
magnificence of aura surrounding the Lord of Hosts.

<sup>1</sup> Frag. Murat. 23-26 (ed. B.F. Westcott, ap. Canon of the N.T. p.524).

<sup>2</sup> e.g. I Apol. lii,3.

<sup>3</sup> Dial. xiv,8.

<sup>4</sup> e.g. Dial. lxxv,3.

<sup>5</sup> Dial. xxix,1.

<sup>6</sup> Dial. xxxvi,6.



'The twelve apostles, who depend on the power of Christ, the eternal priest ... through their voice it is that all the earth has been filled with the glory and grace of God and of His Christ.'<sup>1</sup> The glory of God is either common to God and His Christ or is synonymous with Christ. Glory is clearly something akin to the Shekhinah whether a periphrasis for God or a hypostasis. We have seen above<sup>2</sup> how Justin accounts for the theophanies of the O.T. by attributing these to the Logos-Christ, the second God. There is nothing therefore inconsistent in claiming that Doxa is in fact the being of Christ who is Himself the visible brightness of God. Justin is very specific about this in several passages. 'I shall give you another testimony from the Scriptures that God begat before all creatures (ἀρχὴν πρὶ πάντων τῶν κτισμάτων) who was δύναμιν τινὰ ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ λογικὴν, ἥτις καὶ δόξα κυρίου ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου καλεῖται, ποτὲ δὲ υἱός, ποτὲ δὲ σοφία, ποτὲ δὲ ἄγγελος, ποτὲ δὲ θεός, ποτὲ δὲ κύριος καὶ λόγος, ποτὲ δὲ ἀρχιτέκτων ἑαυτὸν λέγει ἐν ἀνθρώπου μορφῇ φανεῖν τῷ τοῦ Ναυῆ Ἰησοῦ ... He can be called by all those names since He ministers to the Father's will'.<sup>3</sup>

In this passage, Justin identifies doxa with the Son, with Sophia, with God and Lord and Logos. Nothing could be clearer than that God's glory is being personified.

Justin continued in the same mould of thought: 'The Word of Wisdom, who is Himself this God begotten of the Father of all things, and Word, and Wisdom, and Power of the Glory of the Begetter, will bear evidence to me when He speaks by Solomon.'<sup>4</sup>

Justin is even more clear in an extended passage: 'And that Christ being Lord and God the Son of God, and appearing formerly δυναμί as Man and Angel and in the glory of Fire as at the bush ... has been demonstrated.'<sup>5</sup> And further, 'And do not suppose, sirs, that I am

<sup>1</sup> Dial. xlii, 1.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 23.

<sup>3</sup> Dial. lxi, 1.

<sup>4</sup> Dial. lxi, 3.

<sup>5</sup> ibid. cxxviii, 1ff.

speaking superfluously when I repeat these words frequently,<sup>1</sup> ... the δύνamis sent from the Father of all appeared to Moses ... is called Angel ... is called δόξα because He appears in a vision which sometimes cannot be endured ... is called Ἀνῆξ and Ἀνέφωτος ... because He appears arrayed in such forms as the Father pleases; and they call him Λόγος ... but this δύνamis is ἄτμητος and ἀχώριστος from the Father.<sup>2</sup> Justin does not view this δύνamis as a synonym or indeed as anything which is simply different in name; he is sure that it is different in number (ἀριθμῷ ἑτέρον τι).<sup>3</sup> He further informs us that the numerical distinction of this dynamis occurs not by abscission (ἀποτέμνη) as if the essence (οὐσία) of the Father had been divided (ἀπομεφίζεμένη) in the same way that other things, when they are divided and cut, are no longer the same as they were before they were cut.<sup>4</sup> Doxa is an important element in the way Justin considered the Christ Logos. His description of Doxa leads to a conclusion that he was subordinationist in his theogony.

In our summing up, we conclude that Justin's beliefs in the Sonship of Christ were flat and that this played an insignificant role in Salvation. Only in a remarkably few references did Salvation imply Salvation from sin. Justin expressed no view on ideas of man's reconciliation with God; he seemed to know nothing of the concept of Salvation as the doctrine that Man, once held in slavery by sin, has to be purchased at a price out of his slavery and that the crucifixion was the price. Where Justin refers to a Redeemer, he either looks to God as the Redeemer or used a highly conventionalized title of Redeemer for Christ. We could not make out a clear statement by Justin that Christ was in any way the λύτρον. Justin seemed to know nothing of the N.T. doctrine of Salvation that sin plays a part as a debt where God is a creditor, satisfied with payment for the debt and willing to remit the debt at the cost of Christ's death. Despite the many references in Justin to the blood of Christ, he did not link this with Salvation, with the view that the life and death of Christ

<sup>1</sup>Dial. cxxviii,2.

<sup>2</sup>ibid. cxxviii,3.

<sup>3</sup>ibid. cxxviii,4; cf. lxii,2; lvi,11; cxxix,4.

<sup>4</sup>ibid. cxxix,4.



was a pure and unblemished sacrifice. There was evidence, however, that Justin held to a penal substitution view of sacrifice where desired results were obtained from God by the manner of the sacrificial offering. We found in this evidence that Christ's sacrifice was not a symbolic one, but essential per se. But we had no recognition of the spiritual gifts which flowed from this sacrifice since there was great emphasis upon the exorcistic effects of this sacrifice. The cross to Justin had a cosmic, cultic significance so much so that at times we seemed to be very near to the essential elements of the taurobolium. In Justin, the concept of a Saviour did not seem to add a great deal to the person of Christ. In those passages where Saviour is a title of Christ, it appears much as a formal title of a kind familiar to Gnostics or devotees of Asiatic mystery religions.

In Justin, Christ is the Mediator. He has the royal functions of a Ruler and at the second advent, power and royal honour are given to Him by God. We have noted how the influence of Gnosticism was not entirely absent from Justin's descriptive titles of the Mediator and in certain passages, there was a marked similarity with magic, exorcism and Gnostic imagery.

Despite the intimate connection between doxa and basileia in the N.T. and elsewhere, there was no apocalyptic doxa attached to Christ's future basileia after the parousia. 'Glory' belonged to God alone and He gave it to Christ. We were led to believe that this was the Shekhinah of the Targums. But in Justin's thinking, doxa was more than a radiant magnificence surrounding the Lord of Hosts; there was a good deal to persuade us that doxa was a hypostasis and that in his frequent application of the idea to Christ, he was not far removed from a subtle subordinationism.

This element of subordinationist thinking in Justin must not be magnified in importance to the exclusion of all balance. Christ is indisputably God for Justin. But the Christ-Logos nevertheless plays a subordinate role to God in much of Justin's turn of phrase; the one ministers to the other, the one is second in status to the other and derives his purpose and power from the other. This in general terms is subordinationism. Possibly every Christological theory until the 4th century A.D. was more or less subordinationist and there is no need to try to find a label for Justin with any particular form of subordinationism. For the Theodotians, the person of Christ was entirely human, having the Logos as controlling Spirit. In the view of Paul of Samosata also, the personality of Jesus was entirely human. This is not what we are stating.

Subordinationism in the terms of this thesis is a general term, descriptive of any tendency early or late which regarded the Son as sub ordine in authority and divinity to the Father. Where the Glory was not equal, where the Basileia was not co-eternal, if one member of the Trinity is afore another or after another, if the Son was not co-equal with the Father or if He was not equal to the Father as touching His Godhead, subordinationism was present. The term obviously is not a pejorative one.

In demonstrating that Justin was not unique in this matter, we must attempt to sum up our conclusions. We have concluded that Logos-Christ performed all things through the will of God. The Son is not the great Reconciler, but God is. God is the one who wields direction in the relationship, as far as the Parousia is concerned. In establishing a new Jerusalem, the Logos-Christ is an agent of the Supreme God. The sacrifice of Christ was significant and essential per se and not because it betokened an intimate or indissoluble relationship with God. Indeed, there was much to remind us in Christ's death of the taurobolium where blood was cathartic. Christ was therefore an instrument of God as far as salvation was concerned. The Son of the true God is in second place. The Word did not possess from all eternity a separate existence from the Father. He was minister to the Father and begotten of the Father by the Father's will. The unutterable God clearly takes precedence over the Logos. After God, there is no more royal archon than the Logos and if the Logos was an archon, or an angel, or Anthropos or archistrategos, He was less than God. Glory was shed on Christ by His Father and it was not Christ's by right. The Glory is of God and God gives it to Christ alone. Indeed, Christ is God's glory. In the same way, God gives Basileia to Christ.



### Gnosticism

In the study of the nature of God up to the present, we have been compelled to refer frequently to Gnosticism. On the one hand, we have felt Justin to be retreating from a Gnostic position; on the other hand, we have noted Gnostic influences upon his thinking. It is time therefore to embrace the entire subject of the influence of Gnosticism on Justin.

The Gnostics generally separated the Supreme God from the God of the O.T. Sometimes this led to a wholesale rejection of the O.T., sometimes they asserted that the O.T. revealed nothing of the Supreme God. Justin certainly did not reject the O.T. since the Dialogue's apologia is based on extensive quotations from the O.T. But time and time again, Justin interprets the appearance of God and His utterances to the patriarchs as belonging not to the Supreme God, but to the Logos-Christ. The systems of the Gnostics left little room for belief in a personal God. We search fruitlessly for evidence of the strong and secure faith in a living, personal God in the work of Justin, and this despite the references to the Son of God and Father of the All. We have noted above<sup>1</sup> that although there is a kind of spirituality present, there is little which could lead us to believe in an intimate and personal relationship between God and man.

What was true of Justin, was true too of the Gnostics. Furthermore we found little in Justin that reminded us of the relationship of Jesus to His Father as found for example in St. John. Where Justin referred to the Father of the all and to Christ the Son of God, one has the feeling that he is borrowing the technical terminology of the Gnostics. Without a doubt, Justin accepted that God was Himself the Creator and there was no higher God.<sup>2</sup> The responsibility of God for creation was complete. But he couches his technical terms for stating this in non-biblical and in indisputably Gnostic terminology. Whether his thought is Gnostic or whether he is simply using Gnostic terms needs closer analysis; what is beyond all doubt, is that he was influenced by Gnosticism if he deliberately

<sup>1</sup>See p. 75.

<sup>2</sup>e.g. Dial. xi,1; lx,2.

chose appellatives of God from Gnostic texts in preference to those of the O.T. We constantly meet the expressions  $\gamma\epsilon\nu\nu\eta\tau\omega\epsilon\ \tau\omega\nu$   $\acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\nu$ ,<sup>1</sup>  $\pi\alpha\tau\eta\rho\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\nu$ ,<sup>2</sup>  $\delta\epsilon\epsilon\pi\acute{o}\tau\eta\varsigma\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\nu$ ,<sup>3</sup>  $\pi\omicron\iota\eta\tau\eta\varsigma\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\nu$ ,<sup>4</sup>  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\nu\ \delta\eta\mu\iota\omicron\upsilon\rho\epsilon\gamma\acute{o}\varsigma$ ,<sup>5</sup>  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\nu\ \kappa\tau\iota\acute{\sigma}\tau\eta\varsigma$ <sup>6</sup> κτλ.

Justin also uses the same range of expressions, but extends them with  $\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \acute{\omicron}\lambda\alpha$ .<sup>7</sup> These are the common descriptions of God used throughout the range of Gnostic writings and by way of example, in the system of the Sethian-Ophites,<sup>8</sup> the Apocryphon of John,<sup>9</sup> the Gospel of Truth<sup>10</sup> and as frequently elsewhere. The fullness of all things according to many Gnostics was the pleroma. This was the totality or the completeness of all things. From the pleroma proceeded all creation, good and bad. Justin knows the word  $\tau\acute{o}\ \pi\lambda\acute{\eta}\rho\omega\mu\alpha$  since he uses it in quotations from the LXX.<sup>11</sup> He avoids its use when he wishes to refer to the cosmos. Justin uses instead  $\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha$  and  $\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \acute{\omicron}\lambda\alpha$  as synonyms for the pleroma.<sup>12</sup> Used in combination with the various appellatives for God,  $\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha$  and  $\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \acute{\omicron}\lambda\alpha$  deepen the Gnostic tone of these designations of the Supreme God.

We have noted above that although Justin uses the appellation of Father for God, he does not use it in an O.T. way since Justin almost invariably links the Fatherhood of God with Creation.<sup>13</sup> The idea of  $\acute{\omicron}\ \pi\alpha\tau\eta\rho\ \tau\omega\nu\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\nu$  is extremely frequent in Gnostic

<sup>1</sup> e.g. I Apol. xiii,4.

<sup>2</sup> e.g. I Apol. viii,2.

<sup>3</sup> e.g. I Apol. xii,9.

<sup>4</sup> e.g. I Apol. xx,2.

<sup>5</sup> e.g. I Apol. viii,2.

<sup>6</sup> e.g. II Apol. v(vi),2.

<sup>7</sup> e.g. I Apol. xlv,2; lxi,3,10; lxiii,11,14; lxiii,15; Dial. vii,3.

<sup>8</sup> e.g. Irenaeus, adv. Haer. I,30,2

<sup>9</sup> e.g. W. Foerster, Gnosis, I, 22,20, p.107.

<sup>10</sup> E. Hennecke, N.T. Apocrypha, I,p.237 (Eng. trans.).

<sup>11</sup> Dial. xxii,9; xxxvi,3; lxxiii,4.

<sup>12</sup> He uses the LXX  $\tau\acute{o}\ \pi\lambda\acute{\eta}\rho\omega\mu\alpha$  in quoting from the O.T. e.g. Dial. xxii,9; xxxvi,3; lxxiii,4.

<sup>13</sup> See p. 51.



literature. If to this is coupled the fact that Justin has little concept of a real filial relationship with the Father and shows little familiarity with a developing and intimate bond between God and His Son or His sons<sup>1</sup> (as exemplified in Jesus' use of Abba), we are drawn to a conclusion that Justin shared the viewpoint of the Gnostics that there was little room in *ἡ ἀρχὴ* for a personal God.

Justin, like the Gnostics, did not consider the God of the O.T. to be the sole God. The Christ of God, as Son of the maker of all things (*ὁ ποιητὴς τῶν ὅλων* - a non-Biblical, but Gnostic expression) was also God.<sup>2</sup> Justin's writings are full of such statements.<sup>3</sup> The theophanies of God in the O.T. are all explained away by Justin as being manifestations of this *ἐκείνῳ*,<sup>4</sup> and this God was *ὁ ἀληθὴς θεὸς*.<sup>5</sup> It follows too that if the theophanies of the O.T. are not of the Supreme God, but of this second God, the O.T. God in his theophanies was not Creator since as we have seen the Supreme God is the *ποιητὴς πάντων*.<sup>6</sup> We are moving in areas of Gnostic thought. There is much here which the Valentinians would support, notably in the system of Ptolemaeus where Christ proclaimed the knowledge of the Father who could not be seen or heard, but is known only through the only begotten.<sup>7</sup>

The God who appeared in the O.T. theophanies cannot be the supreme Father because the latter was too far removed to have direct contact with 'a little portion of the earth' and cannot have left His universal care for the world to become circumscribed by incarnation in one small corner of the cosmos.<sup>8</sup>

Gnostics, like most Greek philosophers, fostered the belief that matter was eternal and therefore to some extent independent of the Creator. But there is no clear evidence that Justin accepted the eternal nature of matter although he seems to lean that way, possibly under the influence of Platonism. We have been taught that God *ἐποίησεν* created all

<sup>1</sup> See p. 76.

<sup>2</sup> *Dial.* xlviii, 2.

<sup>3</sup> e.g. *Dial.* lv, 1; lvi, 1; lix, 1.

<sup>4</sup> e.g. *Dial.* lvi-lvii, *passim*.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* xxxviii, 4.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* xv, 2; xxv, 5; lviii, 1; lxvii, 2.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* *adv. Iac.* I, 2, 5.

<sup>8</sup> *Dial.* lx, 2.

things ἐξ ἀμόρφου ὕλης.<sup>1</sup> Justin recognized that the Platonists were very influential in his thinking about the origin of matter: 'it was from our teachers - we mean the account given through the prophets - that Plato borrowed his statement that God ὕλην ἀμόρφον οὐρανόν, ὁτρέψαντα κόσμον ποιῆσαι.<sup>2</sup> Albinus uses ἀμόρφος of ὕλη; ἀμόρφος is not used by Plato in his dialogues: αὐτὴν δὲ καθ' αὐτὴν ἀμορφὴν τε ὑπάρχειν.<sup>3</sup> At the same time, Justin is unequivocal in stating that he disagrees with some who say that the world is unbegotten: ἢ καὶ τὸν κόσμον οὐ ἀγέννητον λέγεις;<sup>4</sup> but this does not answer the question since there is a profound distinction between the cosmos and hyle in Platonist cosmology. Justin however gives a further hint about origins when he claims that 'it is proved that there are angels who always exist and are never reduced to that form out of which they sprang'.<sup>5</sup> When a patristic writer refers to the creation of the world and its beginning, we need to ask whether he means God's bringing order out of chaos or whether God is responsible for the existence of everything apart from Himself. Justin does not give a clear answer on this point.

H. Jonas claimed to see two systems of dualism in Gnostic speculation.<sup>6</sup> These offered different explanations for the rift between God and the world, the world and man, spirit and flesh; an Iranian system started from a dualism of two opposed principles to explain how original darkness came to engulf elements of the Light and a Syrian system derived the dualism itself and the predicament of the divine in the system of creation by means of a genealogy of personified divine states evolving from one another. This system afforded metaphysical status to knowledge and ignorance as modes of the divine life itself and it could therefore do

<sup>1</sup> I Apol. x, 2.

<sup>2</sup> ibid. lix, 1.

<sup>3</sup> Albinus, Didask. viii, 2; cf. Plat. Tim. 50B-52B. The word ἀμόρφος is found in the LXX only in Wisdom xi, 17. In view of the Hellenistic influence in Wisdom, such a usage is not surprising.

<sup>4</sup> Dial. v, 1.

<sup>5</sup> ibid. cxxviii, 4.

<sup>6</sup> H. Jonas, The Gnostic Religion, pp. 236-237.



full justice to a redemptional claim on behalf of knowledge. Without suggesting that Justin was as thorough-going a Gnostic as to subscribe to all these claims of Jonas, there are certainly enough allusions in Justin to allow us to speculate on how nearly Justin approached these claims.

Evil daemons were far more real to Justin than were the good angels in close fellowship with Christ. This fact is demonstrated everywhere in Justin. He says little of their origin. 'But that therefore angels exist and ever remain, without being resolved again into that out of which they came into existence, has been demonstrated.'<sup>1</sup> These evil daemons derived their existence from the Creator, but they certainly posed as a substantial element in what must be a semi-dualistic cosmos if they were never again to be resolved (ἀναλυόμενοι). If there was a threat to the enlightened, it was through the evil daemons who lurked everywhere. There are hints here of a modified Iranian system of Gnosticism.

The Syrian system according to Jonas postulated a genealogy of personified divine states and these will be discussed below.<sup>2</sup> The system afforded a metaphysical status to γνῶσις and redemption was obtained by the Gnostics through γνῶσις. Justin emphasised that Christ saved men as a Teacher. What perception and understanding mankind possessed before the appearance of the Christ-Logos were dim; the teaching of Christ gave strength to the knowledge of the truth. 'Our teacher of these things is Jesus Christ.'<sup>3</sup> Justin proposes an exemplarist theory according to which Christ came to overcome the daemons, to display γνῶσις and light to mortals so that they could eradicate their shortcomings and make the choice for a higher life. The purpose for Christ's coming was to teach us.<sup>4</sup> The implication is that if men are in possession of the gnosis given by Christ they can choose their future quality of life.<sup>5</sup> This is not a full dualism obviously; but there are elements here of gnostic emphasis on the importance of specially revealed knowledge.

<sup>1</sup>Dial. cxxviii,4.

<sup>2</sup>See p.188.

<sup>3</sup>I Apol. xiii,3.

<sup>4</sup>ibid. xxiii,2.

<sup>5</sup>ibid. lxi,10: 'we have learned that we may become the children of  
 προαίρεσεν καὶ ἐπιδοτήμης.

Fully developed Gnosticism was firmly dualistic in that the supposed evil essence of matter was created by a maleficent deity. But such a position was not taken up by the author of the Gdes of Solomon for example, any more than it was by Philo or by the author of the Wisdom of Solomon. All three writers believed that sin had its root in the imperfections of the flesh. This too was a Gnostic view, but not so distinctly Gnostic that we can justify the definition of Gnosticism in terms of it. The Gnostic Ebionites believed that the cosmos had been created by God, but like Justin they attributed sin to the instigation of daemons.<sup>1</sup> Oriental dualism is not discernible in every Gnostic cosmogony. Gnosis was a special kind of redeeming knowledge, revealed by a divine figure. Possession of this knowledge is the sole means of redemption. To this was added knowledge of certain incantations and rites and names for quelling the powers of demons, principalities and powers. We have seen this addition in what we claimed were exorcistic formulae of Justin.<sup>2</sup>

Among all Gnostic systems, there was a difference between the Supreme God and the figure who Redeemed; the Mediator of salvation was not identical with the Being who Created. In systems which were not completely dualistic, the Redeemer played an essential part in refining the higher nature of men through a complicated ritual of soteriological mediation. Justin fulfilled all these conditions of mild Gnosticism. The Jews did not recognize Christ when He came; those to whom He gave prophecies, dedicated themselves to the Unbegotten God  $\delta\iota\alpha\ \tau\epsilon\tilde{\omicron}\ \chi\epsilon\iota\rho\tau\epsilon\tilde{\omicron}$ .<sup>3</sup> The ritual of baptism with a ritual formula and incantation is received; no-one can utter the name of the ineffable God, but in the name of Jesus Christ; he who is illuminated is washed.<sup>4</sup> We do not receive common bread and common drink in this food of the Eucharist, but the food which is blessed by the prayer of His word.<sup>5</sup> Men approach God through the name of Him who was crucified.<sup>6</sup> There are Gnostic parallels in abundance to these examples of Mediatorship.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Epiphanius, xvi (Hene).

<sup>2</sup> See p. 128; I Apol. lxi, passim.

<sup>3</sup> I Apol. xlix, 5.

<sup>4</sup> ibid. lxi, passim.

<sup>5</sup> ibid. lxvi, passim.

<sup>6</sup> ibid. xi, 5.

<sup>7</sup> e.g. Irenaeus, adv. Haer. I, 3, 1. Hippol. v, 12, 6-7.

Codex Jung = L. de Heecker, H.L. A oory ma, I, p. 236 (Eng. Trans.)



We find in the Gnostic systems the most complex genealogies and a complex of appellatives so involved that it is frequently difficult to find to whom they refer.<sup>1</sup> There are several chapters in Justin where we have a series of titles for Christ e.g. Beginning, Glory, Son, Wisdom, Angel, God, Lord, Logos.<sup>2</sup> The fact that these are all biblical terms is no rebuttal since many, if not most of the names for Christ in the Gnostic writings are familiar biblical titles too. In one such list of titles in Justin, Christ is called 'Αγγελος<sup>3</sup>, a recognizable and frequent Gnostic usage.<sup>4</sup> Perhaps Justin has gathered the titles of several hypostases and fused them into one entity.

The Gnostics, like most people everywhere, believed that men were possessed by demons which drew them to commit evil. We have seen above how these demons were exorcised and we drew attention to parallels in Justin.<sup>5</sup> The name of Jesus for Justin was of powerful potency in exorcism.<sup>6</sup> 'For every demon, when exorcised in the name of this very Son of God ... is overcome and subdued.'<sup>7</sup> Every pagan was possessed by demons which would need to be expelled before receiving salvation.<sup>8</sup> This concept of exorcising demons before receiving salvation is very common in Gnostic writings,<sup>9</sup> although we would not seek to attach a Gnostic label to Justin on this basis alone.

Among the Gnostics, a constant assertion was repeated that Christ revealed a God who was hitherto unknown. In the system of Cerinthus, the world did not know the God who is over all things. Christ descended on Jesus after his baptism and proclaimed the unknown Father.<sup>10</sup> The Good is

<sup>1</sup> e.g. Irenaeus, adv. Haer. I, 29, 1-4

<sup>2</sup> Dial. lxi, 3; ibid. cxxvi, 1.

<sup>3</sup> Dial. ccxxviii, 2; in the same sentence, Christ is also called 'Αγγελος so that it is not possible to read the reference as if the two words were synonymous.

<sup>4</sup> e.g. Irenaeus, adv. Haer. I, 8, 5.

<sup>5</sup> See p. 128.

<sup>6</sup> e.g. Dial. lxxxv, passim.

<sup>7</sup> ibid. lxxxv, 2.

<sup>8</sup> I Apol. xiv, 1-2.

<sup>9</sup> e.g. Acts of John, E. Hennecke, N.T. Apocrypha, II, pp. 236-237 (Eng. trans.) Hippol. Ref. v, 12, 6-7 (Migne.).

<sup>10</sup> Irenaeus, adv. Haer. I, 26, 1

one, in the system of Valentinus, and His presence is the manifestation through the Son.<sup>1</sup> The Forefather was known only to Only-Begotten ... while to all the rest He is invisible and incomprehensible.<sup>2</sup> The Logos is He who is called "the Saviour" since that is the name of the work which He must do for the redemption of those who have not known the Father; this is the viewpoint of the author of the Gospel of Truth.<sup>3</sup>

Justin looks to the Christ-Logos as Him who reveals the Supreme God. The nature of this Supreme God is largely unknown. 'We see that men approach God ... through the name of Him who was crucified, Jesus Christ.'<sup>4</sup> Who is this Supreme God? At one point Justin says that we give to a crucified man a place *μετὰ τὸν ἀτρέπτον καὶ αἰὶ ὄντα θεόν*.<sup>5</sup> In Valentinian Gnosticism, ἀτρέπτος is the name given to the ultimate principle of existence.<sup>6</sup> God is perpetually *ἐν ἀπαθείᾳ*.<sup>7</sup> The terms 'Father', 'God', 'Creator', 'Lord' and 'Master' do not define what the Supreme One is, but are appellations derived from His good deeds and functions.<sup>8</sup> God is beyond human reason and what little we understand of Him is quite inexpressible. God is simply ἀῤῥήτος: *ὄνομα γὰρ τῷ ἀῤῥήτῳ θεῷ οὐδεὶς ἔχει εἰπεῖν*.<sup>9</sup>

Albinus states too that the Absolute is ἀῤῥήτος<sup>10</sup> and in this Maximus of Tyre agrees with him.<sup>11</sup> The word ἀῤῥήτος is a favourite word of Justin's to describe God<sup>12</sup> and it is a typical usage of the apophatic way of referring to the Supreme Principle. It is not used in the LXX<sup>13</sup> and it is found only once in the N.T. but does not refer

<sup>1</sup> Clement, Strom. ii,20.

<sup>2</sup> Irenaeus, adv. Haer. I,2,1

<sup>3</sup> R.M. Grant, Gnosticism: an Anthology, p.146.

<sup>4</sup> Dial. xi,4.

<sup>5</sup> I Apol. xiii,4.

<sup>6</sup> Epiphanius, xxxi,5.

<sup>7</sup> e.g. II Apol. i,2.

<sup>8</sup> ibid. v(vi),2.

<sup>9</sup> e.g. I Apol. lxi,11.

<sup>10</sup> Albinus, Didask. x,1; x,3; x,4 (ed. Hermann).

<sup>11</sup> Max. Tyr. Philosoph. ix,D (Hobein).

<sup>12</sup> e.g. I Apol. lxi,11; II Apol. x,8; xii,4; Dial. cxxvi,2; cxxvii,2,4.

<sup>13</sup> But cf. Sym. Lev. xviii,23.



directly to God.<sup>1</sup> The word expresses the idea that God is beyond human reason and that what little we know about Him is inexpressible in words. Plato found himself in difficulty thinking of God as being the highest Idea in a hierarchy of Ideas, so much so that in his later works, he thought of God as transcending Ideas entirely. Ideas in Albinus as in Philo are rational projections from God.<sup>2</sup> Justin seems not to want to say as much as this and one wonders again whether the concept of a God  $\alpha\rho\rho\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma$ , familiar to the Middle Platonists, came to Justin through Gnosticism.

The word is a familiar one to the Gnostics expressing the Principle which cannot be referred to in words. Sige kept silence on that which she could not express as  $\tau\alpha\ \alpha\rho\rho\eta\tau\alpha$ .<sup>3</sup> Basilides discusses the word as a preamble to discussing in apophatic language the non-existent God.<sup>4</sup> One cannot deduce much from Justin's use of the word  $\alpha\rho\rho\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma$ . But it is significant how easily Justin moves in the terminology common to Middle Platonists and Gnostics. When Justin visualized his Platonist metaphysics, his reality was defined in Gnostic colours. For Cerinthus, as for Justin, the Supreme Father of the all was unknown<sup>5</sup> while the God of the O.T. was an angel.<sup>6</sup> Cerinthus, like Justin, supported the view of a strongly Jewish eschatological teaching. Christ when he comes will establish a reign on earth, in the city of Jerusalem where the elect will live for a thousand years.<sup>7</sup> Cerinthus and Justin entertained similar claims on this point.

Justin did not arrive at a position where Christ was fully God and fully man. He is unequivocal when he claims that Christ was God.<sup>8</sup> But to what degree Christ possessed also the nature of a mortal man without qualification of any kind is not so certain. The Gnostics saw in the person of Jesus Christ a redeeming figure. But they wanted to distinguish between a heavenly aeon, Christ, and the human appearance of that aeon.

<sup>1</sup>cf. II Cor. xii,4.

<sup>2</sup>Albinus, Didask. ix,1:  $\epsilon\gamma\tau\iota\ \delta\epsilon\ \eta\ \iota\delta\epsilon\alpha\ \omega\varsigma\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \pi\rho\omicron\varsigma\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\ \nu\omicron\gamma\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ .

<sup>3</sup>Clem. exc. Thdt. xxix.

<sup>4</sup>Hippol. Ref. vii,20.

<sup>5</sup>Irenaeus, adv. Haer. I,26,1

<sup>6</sup>ibid; cf. Epiphanius, Haer. xxviii,6.1.

<sup>7</sup>Euseb. Eccles. Hist. III,xxviii (Loeb).

<sup>8</sup>e.g. Dial. xxxiv,2.

Some Gnostics taught that there was no real union between Christ and the man Jesus, thereby preaching a Docetism or an Adoptionism; others taught that the body of Jesus was a heavenly, psychical phantasy, sprung only from the womb of Mary in appearance. But they all in the last analysis denied the true human nature of the Christ.

Justin is careful to make the Nativity an extraordinary event, a birth which was different from other births and peculiar to that particular situation: Εἰ δὲ καὶ ἰδίως, παρὰ τὴν κοινὴν γένεσιν, γεγεννηῖσθαι αὐτὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ λέγομεν λόγον Θεοῦ.<sup>1</sup> The expressions ἰδίως and παρὰ τὴν κοινὴν γένεσιν are very strong. But in Christian belief the birth of the Christ-child was a perfectly normal event; it was in no respect ἰδίως and it was not different from any other birth. Christian tradition has it that the conception was different. But this is not what Justin says. Even the quality of the suffering of Christ, according to Justin was not like that of the suffering which mortal men suffer, but it had the quality of being τὸ ἴδιον i.e. it was not the sensual suffering of men, but different in kind: ὥστε μηδὲ τὸ ἴδιον τοῦ πάθους ἥττονα δοκεῖν εἶναι τοῦτον.<sup>2</sup> Justin is even more anxious to deny the fundamental humanity of the Logos-Christ. 'And what is spoken of as 'the blood of the grape' signifies τοῦ ἔχειν μὲν αἷμα τὸν φανηδόμενον, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐξ ἀνθρωπείου σπέρματος, ἀλλ' ἐκ θείας δυνάμεως.<sup>3</sup> According to Jewish belief, 'the life' or 'the soul' (נֶפֶשׁ) of the flesh lies in the blood.<sup>4</sup> This was the vital principle common to all sentient organisms. In the Christ Logos, this was different since it was obtained not from human stock, but from an entirely different source. Christ in the last analysis, according to Justin, was God of God, but not Man of man or even God born of man.

A further observation which would indicate that Justin has a non-biblical view of the Incarnation, lies in the fact that Justin believes

<sup>1</sup>I Apol. xxii,2.

<sup>2</sup>ibid. xxii,4.

<sup>3</sup>ibid. xxxii,9; cf. xxxii,11.

<sup>4</sup>Lev. xvii,11.



that the power (δύναμις) of God came upon the virgin, overshadowed her and caused her while yet a virgin to conceive: ἀλλὰ δύναμις Θεοῦ ἐπελθοῦσα τῇ παρθένῳ ἐπιόκιάδεν αὐτήν.<sup>1</sup> The N.T. reference on which this tradition is based is Luke, i,35: πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπελεύδεται ἐπὶ ἐμέ, καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου ἐπιόκιάσει μοι. Justin virtually quotes the Lucan passage elsewhere: πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπ' αὐτήν ἐπελεύδεται καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου ἐπιόκιάσει αὐτήν.<sup>2</sup> At this point, we are not concerned to investigate the identity or otherwise of πνεῦμα κυρίου and δύναμις ὑψίστου<sup>3</sup> in Justin's Dialogue and Luke. But it is necessary to look more closely at the expression δύναμις Θεοῦ ... ἐπεόκιάδεν of Justin's Apology referred to above. The Christ-Logos is the Dynamis of God throughout Justin; e.g. 'It is wrong to understand the Spirit and Power of God as anything else than the Word, who is also the first-born of God.'<sup>4</sup> We have in the Apology reference, therefore, a declaration that the Logos-Christ was the non-human agent in His own conception. We cannot agree with L.W. Barnard<sup>5</sup> or with E.R. Goodenough<sup>6</sup> both of whom seem to think that although it was through the agency of a δύναμις τοῦ λόγου that Jesus was born of the Virgin as a man, δύναμις was only given by God to the Logos in order that the Logos might become incarnate. The Apology reference to δύναμις Θεοῦ is not based on the N.T. The nearest parallel is to be found in the Protevangelium of James xi,3: 'And the angel of the Lord said, 'Not so, Mary; δύναμις γὰρ Θεοῦ ἐπιόκιάσει μοι.'<sup>7</sup> This is a far from fanciful source of Justin's statement since at I Apol. xxxiii,5 Justin combines Luke, i,31,32,35 with Matt. i,21 just as does the author

<sup>1</sup>I Apol. xxxiii,4.

<sup>2</sup>Dial. c,5.

<sup>3</sup>See p. 24 ff.

<sup>4</sup>I Apol. xxxiii,6; Dial. lxi,1.

<sup>5</sup>L.W. Barnard, op. cit. p.118.

<sup>6</sup>E.R. Goodenough, op. cit. pp.236-7.

<sup>7</sup>K. Aland, Synopsis Quattuor Evangelium, p.4.

of the Protevangelium of James, xi,3.<sup>1</sup> The same writer relates that the birth of Jesus took place in a cave<sup>2</sup> as does Justin.<sup>3</sup> Our author refers elsewhere to the fact that: 'through the power of the Word ... He was born of a virgin as a man'.<sup>4</sup> In the Dialogue, 'He proceeded ... from the Father by His Power and Will.'<sup>5</sup> We see in Justin clear evidence that the Logos was creator of His own humanity. This is a Gnostic belief stated in Tertullian as, for example in the adversus Praxeam, he discusses Luke, I,3-5: spiritus Dei superveniet in te and adds that in the Gnostic system hic Spiritus Dei idem erit Sermo. Clement of Alexandria discusses the system of Ptolemaeus in which Jesus Christ when he came to the 'place' put on the psychic Christ.<sup>7</sup> The same author is more specific when he interprets John, i,14: 'The Word ... generated himself.'<sup>8</sup> The Christian part of the Sibyllines refers to the same self-generation of the Logos.<sup>9</sup>

The followers of Ptolemaeus were willing to agree that Christ was born in human fashion and had a real body. But they believed that this body was composed of a psychic substance and was not 'earthly' like ours; it had not come from Mary, but had only passed through her.<sup>10</sup> This is a common idea in Justin where the Christ Logos becomes man  $\delta\iota\alpha$   $\pi\alpha\rho\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ .<sup>11</sup> By these references, Justin shows that he does not believe that Christ was truly man. If this argument, admittedly slender, is true, we can strengthen it by seeing an anticipation of the later  $\delta\mu\omicron\upsilon\omicron\epsilon\iota\alpha$  and  $\delta\mu\omicron\upsilon\omicron\epsilon\iota\alpha$  controversies in Justin's use of  $\delta\mu\omicron\upsilon\omicron\epsilon\iota\alpha$   $\pi\alpha\theta\eta\varsigma$

<sup>1</sup> ibid.

<sup>2</sup> Protev. James, 18,1; 19,2 = E. Hennecke, N.T. Apocrypha, pp.383-384.

<sup>3</sup> Dial. lxxviii,5.

<sup>4</sup> I Apol. xlvi,5.

<sup>5</sup> Dial. c,4.

<sup>6</sup> Tertull. adv. Prax. xxvi (Migne).

<sup>7</sup> Clem. Lxc. Thdt. lx.

<sup>8</sup> id. Strom. v,3,16,5.

<sup>9</sup> Sibyll. viii,429; 459-469 = E. Hennecke, op. cit. II,739 f.

<sup>10</sup> Irenaeus, adv. Haer. I,7,2: 'This is [Christ] who passed through Mary as water passes through a pipe'.

<sup>11</sup> e.g. I Apol. lxxiii,16; Dial. xlv,4; ibid. lvii,3.



to refer to the sensitivity which the Christ-Logos felt which was similar to (but not the same as) that of a mortal man.<sup>1</sup> One may legitimately point to two references in Justin where ὁμοιοπαθής is used of the sensitivity of one man and another.<sup>2</sup> But Justin is quite specific in denying complete manhood to the Christ: 'There are some who admit that He is Christ, while holding Him to be ἄνθρωπον ἐξ ἀνθρώπου ; with whom I do not agree.'<sup>3</sup> Justin has proven that this man was the Christ of God; he is equally adamant that he disagrees with those who accept the Christ, but believe him to be man of men.

There are several references where Justin unequivocally emphasises the fact that the blood of Christ was not of human seed, but of divine origin and power. For example, he interprets 'the blood of the grape' in Genesis, xlix,10 as signifying that He who should appear would have blood

οὐκ ἐξ ἀνθρωπείου σπέρματος ... ἀλλ' ἐκ  
δυνάμεως Θεοῦ.<sup>4</sup> He further states: ὅτι αἷμα  
μὲν ἔχει ὁ Χριστός, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐξ ἀνθρώπου  
σπέρματος, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ δυνάμεως.<sup>5</sup> This  
statement is given particular prominence since our author repeats it in  
the same chapter.<sup>6</sup> Justin also declares: ὡς τοῦ αἵματος  
αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἐξ ἀνθρωπείου σπέρματος γεγεννημένου  
ἀλλ' ἐκ θελήματος Θεοῦ.<sup>7</sup> And to give this statement further emphasis,  
he repeats it in his prolongation of the argument.<sup>8</sup>

Justin even goes so far as to say that Christ was conceived οὐ  
διὰ συνουσίας, ἀλλὰ διὰ δυνάμεως.<sup>9</sup> The Gnostics denied the  
reality of Christ's human nature as we have seen above and His sufferings  
were only apparent. Since they could have no value and since they could  
effect nothing, redemption was the result of teaching and knowledge. It

<sup>1</sup>II Apol. x,8; Dial. xlviii,3; lvii,3.

<sup>2</sup>II Apol. i,1; Dial. xciii,3.

<sup>3</sup>Dial. xlviii,4.

<sup>4</sup>I Apol. xxxii,11.

<sup>5</sup>Dial. liv,2.

<sup>6</sup>ibid.

<sup>7</sup>ibid. lxiii,2.

<sup>8</sup>ibid.

<sup>9</sup>I Apol. xxxiii,6.

did not result from the Passion. We saw above that Justin emphasised that Christ saved men as a Teacher.<sup>1</sup> He had an exemplarist theory of redemption according to which Christ came to quell the daemons, to demonstrate gnosis and display light to mortals. In this way men could eradicate their shortcomings and make a choice for a nobler life. The purpose of the Incarnation was that Christ might teach us.<sup>2</sup>

Justin believes that to the Supreme Father no name can be given.<sup>3</sup> The ἄγνωστος God is common to all Gnostic systems.<sup>4</sup> What is not as common, but is nevertheless equally Gnostic, is the unknown Christ whose name for Justin has ἄγνωστον δημασίαν.<sup>5</sup> That there was Gnostic influence at work here is not in doubt, although references are few.<sup>6</sup> The Gnostics made use of N.T. passages e.g. Matt. xi,27: 'and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father'; Luke, x,22: 'and no man knoweth who the Son is, but the Father'. It is perhaps the same belief in the unknowability of Christ which will explain the fact that the names 'Jesus' or 'Christ' do not appear in the Shepherd of Hermas, whose author seems to have a prominent name-theology e.g. 'The name of the Son of God is great and incomprehensible and supports the whole world.'<sup>7</sup> We may also speculate on the significance of Christ in Justin's reference to Him as one ὅτι ὁ ταῦτα πάσχων ἀνεκδιήγητον ἔχει τὸ γένος.<sup>8</sup> What can this mean but a gnostic belief in Christ's unknowability if placed against the backcloth of the entire series of claims which we are making?

We see further that Justin assigns the status of ἄρχων to the Word: 'than whom we know there is no ἄρχοντα βασιλικώτατον.'<sup>9</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See p. 139.

<sup>2</sup> e.g. I Apol. xiii, passim; xxiii,2; lxi,10.

<sup>3</sup> II Apol. v(vi),1.

<sup>4</sup> e.g. Irenaeus, adv. Haer. I,19,1; ibid. I,20,2; cf. Acts, xvii,23.

<sup>5</sup> II Apol. v(vi),3.

<sup>6</sup> e.g. Euseb. Eccles. Hist. I,2 (Loeb); Adamantius, Dial. ii,14 (4th cent. A.D.): φάσκει ... ὁ δὲ Χριστὸς ... ὁ παῖς ἄγνωστος

<sup>7</sup> Hermas, Sim. ix,xiv,5.

<sup>8</sup> I Apol. li,1. There is an echo in this of the question at Isaiah, liii,8 (LXX): τὴν γενεάν αὐτοῦ τίς διηγῆσεται;

<sup>9</sup> I Apol. xii,7.



In Gnostic literature, the spirit in its ascent to the highest heavens must pass through the lower heavens which are governed by Archons. Although the term in its straightforward significance means 'rulers', in Gnostic terminology the word is a technical term. Philo has a definition of their status: 'Moses held that the cosmos was created, having archons and subjects; for archons all the heavenly bodies; (these) are οὐκ αὐτεξουσίους, ἀλλ' ἐνὸς τοῦ πάντων πατρὸς ὑπάρχουσ.' <sup>1</sup> Gnostic speculation looked to several LXX references to archons in the Psalms. <sup>2</sup> The Gnostics discussed for example Psalm, xxiii(xxiv),7-9:

Lift up your gates, archons  
And be lifted up, eternal gates;  
And the King of Glory will enter in<sup>3</sup>

Who are the archons? Who is this King of Glory? This is precisely the question posed by Justin, when he engages in the exegesis of this Psalm. <sup>4</sup>

Justin says that the archons in heaven, under appointment of God, are commanded to open the gates of heaven that He who is the King of Glory may enter in. <sup>5</sup> These archons according to Justin did not recognize Christ. We know that according to Gnostic writers, Christ is transformed as He descends through the sphere of the archons to such an extent that He is unrecognizable. <sup>6</sup> The author of the Christian parts of the Ascension of Isaiah makes the Lord Christ unrecognizable as He passes through the heavens. <sup>7</sup> According to the account of Irenaeus, the same unrecognizability was given to Simon Magus. <sup>8</sup> The reference of Justin to Christ as the archon who was not recognized by the archons in heaven is

<sup>1</sup> Philo, Spec. Leg. I,14.

<sup>2</sup> e.g. Psalms, ii,2; xxxii (xxxiii), 10; cvi(cvii),40; cxviii(cxix),161; cxlv(oxlvi),3.

<sup>3</sup> Hippolytus, Refut. v,8,18; The Exegesis of the Hymn to Attis, Gnosticism, An Anthology, R.M. Grant, p.109.

<sup>4</sup> Dial. xxxvi.

<sup>5</sup> ibid. xxxvi,5-6.

<sup>6</sup> Epist. Apost. xiii(= Eng. Trans. E. Hennecke, N.T. Apocrypha, I, pp. 197-198). This Epistle belongs to the second half of the 2nd cent. A.D., although this date is not universally accepted.

<sup>7</sup> Ascens. Isaiah, x,11 = E. Hennecke, op. cit. II,659.

<sup>8</sup> Irenaeus, adv. Haer. I,23,2.

certainly not based on N.T. material. The only reference to Christ as archon is in Rev. i,5 and here it is not in a cosmic role. Elsewhere in the N.T. the principal archon seems to be the ruler of the demons,<sup>1</sup> or of the power of the air,<sup>2</sup> or of the cosmos.<sup>3</sup> Justin is drawing on Gnostic concepts in his exegesis of Psalm xxiii (xxiv),7-9.

We have discussed at some length above the Gnostic influences on Justin's thinking when he employs the concepts of Angel<sup>4</sup> and Anthropos,<sup>5</sup> applying them to the Logos-Christ. We will not repeat at this point those arguments which indicated that Justin was calling on ideas which were not biblical and that if they were Middle Platonist in invention, they were Gnostic in detailed application in the Logos-Christ context. The deduction was an obvious one that Justin shared the beliefs of one Gnostic system or another when he wished to discuss the Pre-existence or the Coming to Earth of the Logos-Christ. That His coming to earth was seen as inglorious, obscure and in suffering by Gnostics as well as by Justin, we have discussed elsewhere too.<sup>6</sup>

We have noted elsewhere that among the appellations given to the Word occurs that of 'Israel'.<sup>7</sup> 'He (sc. the Word) was also named Israel and He gave this name to Jacob'.<sup>8</sup> Justin explains this remark: 'I would like you to teach me, asked Trypho, the δύναμις of the name Israel'.<sup>9</sup> To this Justin answers that the angel who appeared to Jacob 'because He was the first born of all creatures, yet nevertheless is God ... Israel was His name from the beginning to which He altered the name of the blessed Jacob'.<sup>10</sup> The angel who thus appeared to Jacob was named Israel and He was the Word. There is a parallel with Philo where the firstborn Logos is the eldest among the angels; he is archangel and carries many names ... Beginning ... Word ... Israel'.<sup>11</sup> Israel as the name of an

<sup>1</sup>Matt. ix,34; xii,24; Mark, iii,22; Luke, xi,15.

<sup>2</sup>Ephes. ii,2.

<sup>3</sup>John, xii,31; xiv,30; xvi,11.

<sup>4</sup>See p. 105.

<sup>5</sup>See p. 145.

<sup>6</sup>See p. 174.

<sup>7</sup>See p. 107.

<sup>8</sup>Dial. lxxv,2; cf. cxiv,2; cxxx,3; cxxxiv,6; cxxxv,1,3.

<sup>9</sup>ibid. cxxv,1.

<sup>10</sup>ibid. cxxv,3-5.

<sup>11</sup>Philo, Conf. 146-147.



angel is found in the magical papyri.<sup>1</sup> There are several references in a Gnostic work, quoted by Origen in the Prayer of Joseph,<sup>2</sup> which describes Israel as an angel of God and a principal spirit: 'I, Jacob and Israel, who speak to you am an angel of God and one of the principal (ἀρχικόν) spirits. I, Jacob, am called Jacob by men, but my name is Israel, for by God was I called Israel, "the man who sees God", because I am firstborn (πρωτόγονος) of all living things that receive their life from God'.<sup>3</sup> These are the same expressions which we have noted above in Justin. There is a reference from the Nag Hammadi writings where Israel is the name given to the firstborn who lives with Sabaoth.<sup>4</sup> It is impossible to escape a thought that we are moving once more in Gnostic influences.

In this connection, it is necessary to consider Justin's designation of the Logos as ἀρχή.<sup>5</sup> He says: 'God begat ἀρχὴν πρὸ πάντων τῶν κτισμάτων... δύναμιν τινὰ ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ λογικὴν, ἥτις καὶ δόξα κυρίου ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου καλεῖται, ποτὲ δὲ υἱός, ποτὲ δὲ σοφία, ποτὲ δὲ ἄγγελος, ποτὲ δὲ θεός, ποτὲ δὲ κύριος καὶ λόγος.'<sup>6</sup> Justin further says that He whom Solomon calls Wisdom, was begotten as ἀρχή before all His creatures.<sup>7</sup>

Theophilus of Antioch established the same point: εἰ λόγον εἶπω, ἀρχὴν αὐτοῦ λέγω.<sup>8</sup> He links Logos and Arche

<sup>1</sup>J. Barbel, Christos Angelos, pp.207,263.

<sup>2</sup>Origen, Comm. in Joh. I,31; II,31 (ed.Preuschen)Comm. Gen. xii,73B, 81B (ed. Migne); Hom. Num. xvii,4 (ed. Baehrens).

<sup>3</sup>Origen, Comm. in Joh. II,31.

<sup>4</sup>J.R. Doresse, Les livres secrets des gnostiques d'Égypte p.189 (Eng. trans. P. Mairé, The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics).

<sup>5</sup>For an excellent study of the ideas involved, see A. Ehrhardt, The Beginning; for a discussion of value in the slightly later Fathers, see J.M.C. Winden, 'In the Beginning', Vigiliae Christianae, Vol.17 (1963), pp.105-121.

<sup>6</sup>Dial. lxi,1.

<sup>7</sup>ibid. lxii,4.

<sup>8</sup>Theoph. Autol. i,3.

elsewhere: οὗτος (sc. Λόγος) οὖν, ὡν πνεῦμα Θεοῦ καὶ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἐσφία καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου κατήρχετο κτλ.<sup>1</sup> Some of the terminology of the Epistle to the Colossians has a bearing on the term Arche.<sup>2</sup> The Son is πρὸ πάντων<sup>3</sup>; He is ἀρχὴ πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν that in all things He might have pre-eminence'.<sup>4</sup> The Son is ἡ κεφαλὴ πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας.<sup>5</sup>

Plato conceived of Arche as the entrance of the infinite into the empirical world of matter and that which set the cosmos in motion.<sup>6</sup> Like Plato, Aristotle believed that the ἀρχή, and that which is the first of the things existing, is immovable in itself as well in its relation to the outside, yet it sets in motion the primary, eternal and one motion.<sup>7</sup> He defines the term as 'the first principle', 'the first element' and opposes it therefore to words such as ὕλη or Θεός or στοιχεῖα.<sup>8</sup> The Stoics employed the term: δοκεῖ δ' αὐτοῖς ἀρχὰς εἶναι τῶν ὅλων δύο, τὸ ποιοῦν καὶ τὸ πάσχον, τὸ μὲν οὖν πάσχον εἶναι τὴν ἀποιοῦν οὐσίαν, τὴν ὕλην. τὸ δὲ ποιοῦν τὸν ἐν αὐτῇ λόγον, τὸν Θεόν.<sup>9</sup> Aetius has the same viewpoint. For him God is ἀρχή, a first principle, the cause of action, of making, of creating.<sup>10</sup> Diogenes makes a distinction between ἀρχαί and στοιχεῖα.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>1</sup> ibid. ii, 10.

<sup>2</sup> Col. i, 16.

<sup>3</sup> ibid. i, 17.

<sup>4</sup> ibid. i, 18.

<sup>5</sup> ibid. ii, 10.

<sup>6</sup> e.g. Phaedrus, 245C; Tim. 36E-37A; Leg. x 894E-895A, 895B, 896A-B.

<sup>7</sup> Aristot. Metaph. xi, 8, 1073a, 23f.

<sup>8</sup> ibid. 983b 11; de Anim. 405 b 25.

<sup>9</sup> Diog. Laert. vii, 134 (Loeb).

<sup>10</sup> Aetius, I, 3, 25 = Doxographi Graeci, 289 (ed. H. Diels) = Stoic. Vet. Frag. ed. J. von Arnim, I, 85.

<sup>11</sup> Diog. Laert. vii, 134 (Loeb).



Albinus recognizes the existence of three fundamental principles; the  $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta$  is the first,<sup>1</sup> the other two consisting of the principle of  $\acute{\iota}\delta\epsilon\alpha\iota$ <sup>2</sup> and the  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\acute{\eta}$  which is  $\nu\acute{o}\upsilon\varsigma$ ,  $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\acute{\iota}\nu\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma$ , almost  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ .<sup>3</sup> This was called  $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$   $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\pi\tau\omicron\varsigma$  by Albinus.<sup>4</sup> This is a development of Aristotle's first  $\nu\acute{o}\upsilon\varsigma$  which is considered as  $\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu\ \nu\acute{o}\omega\nu$ ; this is for Plato the cause of order i.e. as the demiurge of the Timaeus. Albinus identifies this  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\acute{\eta}$  of the first  $\nu\acute{o}\upsilon\varsigma$  with its Demiurge<sup>5</sup> and as the cause of  $\pi\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$   $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\theta\omicron\upsilon$ .<sup>6</sup>

It is not surprising that Justin with his Middle Platonism should have seized on Arche as a name to apply to the Logos-Christ.

Athenagoras incorporates  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\acute{\eta}$  into a discussion on origins of matter and the first cause; he shows himself to be fully aware of the development of Platonist and Stoic doctrines of  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\acute{\eta}$ , outlined above.<sup>7</sup> Tatian uses  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\acute{\eta}$  with the same complexion of meaning:  $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$   $\delta$   $\kappa\alpha\theta'$   $\eta\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$   $\omicron\upsilon\kappa$   $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\iota$   $\delta\acute{\upsilon}\omicron\tau\alpha\delta\iota\nu$   $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$   $\chi\rho\omicron\nu\omega$ ,  $\mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\varsigma$   $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\rho\chi\omicron\varsigma$   $\acute{\omega}\nu$   $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$   $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\omega\nu$   $\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$   $\acute{\omicron}\lambda\omega\nu$   $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\acute{\eta}$ .<sup>8</sup> He links  $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$  with  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\acute{\eta}$  and adds  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu$   $\acute{\iota}\delta\mu\epsilon\nu$   $\tau\omicron\upsilon$   $\kappa\acute{o}\sigma\mu\omicron\upsilon$   $\tau\acute{\eta}\nu$   $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\acute{\eta}\nu$ .<sup>9</sup> Justin quotes Psalm cix(cx), 3:  $\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}$   $\beta\omicron\upsilon$   $\eta$   $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\acute{\eta}$   $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$   $\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha$   $\tau\acute{\eta}\varsigma$   $\delta\upsilon\nu\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\omega\varsigma$   $\delta\omicron\upsilon$   $\kappa\tau\lambda$ . This particular verse played a great part in the Arian controversy. The Latin versions of the O.T. translate the word by principium,<sup>10</sup> but Justin personalizes it when he identifies Arche with Logos. There is little difference for Justin when he quotes Psalm cix(cx), 3, and when he paraphrases Isaiah, ix, 6: 'unto us a child is born ... and the  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\acute{\eta}$  shall be upon his shoulders'.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Albinus, Didask. viii, 2 (ed. Hermann).

<sup>2</sup> ibid. ix, 1-2.

<sup>3</sup> ibid. x, 1-2.

<sup>4</sup> ibid. iv, 2.

<sup>5</sup> ibid. xii, 1.

<sup>6</sup> ibid. x, 3; cf. Max. Tyr. xi, 5a-b (Hobein).

<sup>7</sup> Athenag. Leg. xix.

<sup>8</sup> e.g. Tat. Orat. iv, 1.

<sup>9</sup> ibid. v, 1; cf. Theoph. ad. Autol. ii, 10.

<sup>10</sup> tecum principium in die virtutis tuae (Vulg.).

<sup>11</sup> I Apol. xxxv, 2.

The belief in spirits which ranked below God, but above mankind, was a welcome reservation in the minds of people who had been led to monotheism, but who yearned for much that lay behind them in their pagan polytheism. Much of the tendency to accept spirits originated in Persian Zoroastrianism. For the Romans, Mithraism provided a medium for the transmission of a belief in such spirits; as for Judaism, the immediate contacts were at first hand in the period of Persian rule. As a result, there arose the two beliefs, one in supernatural powers with rank and order, the other in Satan and his servants. Although earlier and more orthodox Judaism would reject the idea, it was commonly believed in the later period that God had any number of subordinate assistants, some of Pre-Persian origin (like seraphs and cherubs), others of Persian complexion, while Satan became or was conceived of as a fallen angel and given such names as the devil or the evil one, accompanied by his attendant powers.

The angels were named quite frequently in Judaism.<sup>1</sup> We know to what extent Sophia was a hypostasis. Philo elaborated the idea, but preferred the word Logos. A personalized concept of Arche would not be an alien concept to Judaism therefore.<sup>2</sup>

There is some evidence that the first words of Genesis 'In the beginning' were understressed among Jewish commentators. There is a remarkable lack of rabbinical comment on the subject in Strack-Billerbeck.<sup>3</sup> Perhaps the reason for this was the risk of heresy in considering creatio ex nihilo and a future reducing of the world ad nihil. Orthodox Jews wanted to resist the new ideas of the Christians and Alexandrian Jews.<sup>4</sup> Modern commentators have not always studied closely the  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu \acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\eta$  of John, i,1.<sup>5</sup> M. Dods claims that by analogy with  $\acute{\alpha}\pi' \acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\eta\varsigma$ , John's  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu \acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\eta$  is adverbial. But there is no evidence for such an adverbial usage either in the LXX or in the N.T.

<sup>1</sup>cf. I Enoch, xx,1-4 (ed. Charles).

<sup>2</sup>ibid.

<sup>3</sup>cf. Jubilees, ii,2: 'on the first day' for the O.T. 'in the beginning' (ed. Charles).

<sup>4</sup>A. Ehrhardt, op. cit. p.191.

<sup>5</sup>e.g. C.K. Barrett, The Gospel according to St. John (1958), pp.126-127; M. Dods, Expositor's Greek N.T. i(1897), p.683; E. Hoskyns, The Fourth Gospel, ed. F. Noel Davey, 2nd ed.(1947), 140f; M. Wiles, The Spiritual Gospel, ad.loc.; R. Schnackenburg, The Gospel according to St. John, 232f.



A. Ehrhardt claims that moderns have a lack-lustre concept of 'the beginning'.<sup>1</sup> Philo was greatly concerned with ἀρχή and was at pains to eliminate the concept of time from the use of the word in Genesis; he felt that numerical order was indicated by ἐν ἀρχῇ.

A. Ehrhardt took the view that Paul was offering a parallel thought to John, i,1 when he claimed that Christ was the ἀρχή, the first-born from the dead.<sup>2</sup> This ἀρχή of Paul demonstrated that as 'principle' it was acceptable to Jewish thinkers at the commencement of the Christian era in two ways; firstly as the ordering principle (as in Philo), secondly as the creative or causative principle as in the Greek philosophers. Arche as the creative and causative principle would instantly be as welcome an intermediary as the Shekinah (דוֹשָׁא); Ruah, (πνεῦμα); Achamoth (σοφία); Memrah (λογος).

But having suggested this, one cannot easily find in Jewish writers a hypostasized Arche. We may compare Coloss. i,16, εἴτε Θρόνοι εἴτε Κυριότητες εἴτε ἀρχαὶ εἴτε ἐξουσίαι with I Enoch xx,1, 'dominions, orders, governments'. But these are pluralities. Christ in the N.T. is placed far above πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ κυριότητος καὶ παντὸς ὀνόματος.<sup>3</sup> From a study of further N.T. references,<sup>4</sup> we can infer that Christ is of all ἀρχαί the greatest. In Revelation, He is given the name of ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ θεοῦ<sup>5</sup> and later ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ τὸ τέλος.<sup>6</sup> In identifying the Christ-Logos with Arche, Justin, like Theophilus, could certainly find N.T. support.

<sup>1</sup> A. Ehrhardt, op. cit. p.192. The N.E.B, for example, translates John's ἐν ἀρχῇ as 'when all things began'. The Vetus Latina translated Genesis, i,1 with in initio; Jerome translated both Genesis, i,1 and John, i,1 by in principio.

<sup>2</sup> Col. i,18.

<sup>3</sup> Ephes, i,21.

<sup>4</sup> e.g. Rom. viii,38; cf. I Pet. iii,22; I Cor. xv,23-26.

<sup>5</sup> Rev. iii,14.

<sup>6</sup> ibid. xxi,6; xxii,13.

The writer of the Wisdom of Solomon claimed that God αὐτός μοι ἔδωκεν ... εἰδέναι ... ἀρχὴν καὶ τέλος.<sup>1</sup> Were it not for the specific meaning and the echoes in Revelation quoted above, ἀρχή might here be given a temporal significance only. But that there might be a further significance is hinted at by Origen: quod est omnium principium nisi dominus noster ... Christus Jesus? ... in hoc ergo principio, hoc est in verbo suo, Deus coelum et terram fecit.<sup>2</sup> From where did Origen derive his particular idea of principium? The fourth cent. A.D. Hilary of Poitiers says the Hebrew word Breshith: 'tres significantias in se habet id est 'in principio' et 'in capite' et 'in filio'.<sup>3</sup> Hilary is possibly using a tradition inherited from Origen. This might have been used by Tertullian who says aiunt quidem et Genesim in Hebraico ita incipere in principio Deus fecit sibi filium.<sup>4</sup> Is there here a Rabbinic tradition of reshith = filius (i.e. ἀρχή = υἱός)?<sup>5</sup>

This link between ἀρχή, principium and breshith is elucidated by C.F. Burney. He has explained the phrase πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως of Coloss. i,15 as an allusion to Prov. viii,22, 'The Lord begat me as the beginning (חֵן־אֶחָד) of his way'.<sup>6</sup> Judaism imagined Wisdom as a figure of pre-Creation origin and an assistant of God in the actual work of Creation. Burney sees in חֵן־אֶחָד of Proverbs (ἀρχήν) the word חֵן־אֶחָד (ἐν ἀρχῇ) of Gen. i,1. B<sup>e</sup>reshith was therefore explained as meaning 'by Wisdom' and this was used as a key to the understanding of the first verse of Genesis by Rabbinic writers.<sup>7</sup> In Genesis Rab. i,1, R. Hoshaya (c.225 A.D.) said, 'The Torah says, "Through the חֵן־אֶחָד, the first principle, God made heaven and earth," and the חֵן־אֶחָד is nothing other than the Torah.'

<sup>1</sup>Wisd. vii,18.

<sup>2</sup>Orig. Hom. i,1 in Gen. (ed. Baehrens); cf. in Jo. i,22 (ed. Preuschen).

<sup>3</sup>Hil. Pict. Psalm, ii (ed. Migne, ix, p.263,2).

<sup>4</sup>Tertull. adv. Prax. 5 (Migne).

<sup>5</sup>I am greatly indebted in this part of the work to C.F. Burney, Journ. Theol. Studies, xxvii (Jan.1926), 160ff.

<sup>6</sup>cf. LXX: κύριος ἔκτισέ με ἀρχὴν ὧν αὐτός.

<sup>7</sup>e.g. Gen. Rab. i,1.



Burney exhaustively analyses every meaning of B<sup>o</sup>reshith and Reshith. He parallels each meaning by a phrase from the message in Coloss. i,15-18. The case is convincing and in this sense Judaism would find the concept of Arche quite acceptable as a parallel idea with and virtually a synonym of Sophia.<sup>1</sup> One can look to Prov. i,7; ix,10 for support: ἀρχὴ σοφίας φόβος κυρίου<sup>2</sup>; but even if this is unconvincing, yet there is more than enough evidence in the speculation briefly outlined here to demonstrate that the idea of a pre-existing, cosmic ἀρχή was quite a welcome concept in Judaism.

But we cannot rest here as we pursue Justin into Gnosticism. We have seen that Arche was a familiar concept both to Hellenist philosophers and to the writers of Judaism. Did Justin extract this concept from Gnosticism? ἀρχή was certainly used in magical spells. In one papyrus, the magician called on the God as 'first creation of my creation, first arche of my arohe'.<sup>3</sup> In a description of what comprised the magician's arohe is found a kind of mystical union between arche and the deity.<sup>4</sup> Further references in the Hermetic literature extend this magical usage to a cosmogony where the author identifies God, Nature and Energy with Arche<sup>5</sup> and further defines it in a mystical way.<sup>6</sup> That Arche had a powerful existence per se is evident from a neo-Pythagorean fragment of pseudo-Aristaeus: 'it is clear that the ἀρχή by itself is uncreated and eternal, and the cause of creation and motion; and moving all things, it is itself by itself, and producing the other absolute things, it is the absolute itself, by itself.'<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup>This is not to say that wherever Reshith is met in the canon, the idea of a hypostasis of arche or sophia is intended e.g. Gen. x,10; xlix,3; Numb. xxiv,20; Deut. xxi,17; Job,xl,14(19).

<sup>2</sup>cf. Ecclus,i,14. See H. Schultz, O.T. Theology, ii,414 ff; C.A. Biggs, Messianic Prophecy, p.218, n.1; J.M.P. Smith, I.C.C. ad. loc; C.F. Burney, Prophecy and the Prophets in Ancient Israel, p.208.

<sup>3</sup>Papyri Graecae Magicae, iv,488 f, ed. Preisendanz, I,88f.

<sup>4</sup>ibid. xii,323f; id. II,80.

<sup>5</sup>Corp. Herm. iii,1 (ed. Nock).

<sup>6</sup>ibid. iv,10; viii,5.

<sup>7</sup>Pseudo-Aristaeus in Stob. Ecl. I,20,6 ed. Wachsmuth, I,176f.

Clement of Alexandria claimed that only the gnostics are true worshippers because they alone hold in esteem τὴν ἀρχὸν ἀναρχὸν ἀρχὴν τε καὶ ἀπαρχὴν τῶν ὄντων, the Son, from whom we are to learn of the more remote cause, the Father.<sup>1</sup> In the Kerygma of Peter quoted by Clement, we find ἀρχὴν τῶν ἀπάντων ἐποίησεν μηνύων τὸν πρωτόγονον υἱὸν ὁ Πέτρος γράφει.<sup>2</sup> Hippolytus discussed the ἀρχαὶ as members of the spiritual powers and placed them among the good angels in the order of principalities.<sup>3</sup> Origen enumerates, ἀρχαγγέλους τε καὶ θρόνους, καὶ κυριότητας καὶ ἀρχὰς καὶ ἐξουσίας ὑπερανίους.<sup>4</sup> The 3rd cent. A.D. compiler of the Acts of Thomas says ἀπορρήτου μυστηρίου ἀρχῶν τε καὶ ἐξουσιῶν κεκρυμμένων.<sup>5</sup> Other Gnostic writers classified ἀρχαὶ as powers of evil.<sup>6</sup>

The Valentinians possessed the Fourth Gospel and they used the introduction of the Gospel to provide evidence that the Gnostic cosmology was based on scripture. 'John, the disciple of the Lord, intending to speak about the genesis of the universe ... proposes that an ἀρχή was the first product of god, which he calls the son and the only begotten'.<sup>7</sup> This ἀρχή was produced by Bythos, the latter being known as προαρχή. The exegesis by the author of the Excerpta ex Theodoto: 'Arche', they say 'is the Only-begotten'.<sup>9</sup>

It is evident that Justin had as much access to a figure of Arche, the only-begotten, from Gnostic cosmogony as from Middle Platonism or later Judaism. Most of the references to Arche in Justin and in other patristic writers are connected with the Logos, however, and this connection lies far outside the range of Jewish Christian ideas. Nevertheless the Arche was seen in primitive Christian theology as a function of the Logos.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Clem. Strom. vii, i, 2.

<sup>2</sup> ibid. vi, 7, 58.

<sup>3</sup> Hippol. Refut. vi, 19.

<sup>4</sup> Orig. de Crat. 17; cf. Cels. iv, 29.

<sup>5</sup> Act. Thom. 133 (ed. Bonnet).

<sup>6</sup> e.g. Clem. ex Thdt. 77 Origen. Princ. i, 6, 3. (ed. Koetschau).

<sup>7</sup> Irenaeus, adv. Haer. I, 8, 5

<sup>8</sup> ibid. I, 1, 1; I, 9, 2; I, 11, 5.

<sup>9</sup> Clem. ex Thdt. 6, 2; cf. Hippol. Refut. 6, 38.

<sup>10</sup> e.g. John, i, 1.



It was a characteristic of Gnostic writings that they laid stress on the existence of Aeons, real powers and heavenly beings in whom was unfolded the absoluteness of the Supreme Godhead. Arche was such an emanation in the Gnostic writers; although it appears to be a synonym for Logos in Christian writers, we have seen how diverse is its origin. We have suggested elsewhere that the lists of names ascribed to Christ by Justin is typical of Gnostic cosmogonies.<sup>1</sup> I have suggested that Justin was coalescing his terms into one person, that of the Logos. Tatian's doctrine of the Logos is closely related to that of his master Justin. Both have similar ideas in describing the divine and human generation of the Logos as 'not by cutting off' (οὐ κατὰ ἀποτομήν).<sup>2</sup> The generation of the Divine Logos was 'not as if the Father's substance (οὐσία) were divided up (ἀπομεριζομένης), as is the case with all other things which when divided (μεριζόμενα) and cut, are not the same as they were before they were cut'.<sup>3</sup> This 'Angel', as Justin calls Christ here, is Gnostic in appellation and in function; the Angel-Logos is not cut off (οὐ κατὰ ἀποτομήν) as if the Father's οὐσία were divided (ἀπομεριζομένης). ἀποτομή is a term which signifies an excision of letters or syllables from the end of a word; μερίδος classifies parts of speech or distributes the functions of different parts of a sentence into distinct component parts. Since Justin says that the Angel-Logos was not brought into existence in this particular way, he is denying a separate existence to the Angel-Logos although we are still to think of 'this power which the prophetic Word calls God ... and Angel (as) not numbered in name only ... but is ἀριθμῶ ἐτερόν τι'.<sup>4</sup> But with equal precision, the οὐσία of the Father is not divided since this Power was begotten from the Father οὐ κατὰ ἀποτομήν.<sup>5</sup> It is hard to think of the Angel-Christ-Logos as anything but an emanation, not really losing its ontological connection with God. The followers of Ptolemaeus were willing to admit that the Christ was born in human fashion and had a real body; but this body was composed of psychic substance and was not earthly like mortal bodies; this body had not come from Mary and had only passed through her as water passes through a pipe.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>See p. 146, 167.

<sup>2</sup>e.g. Dial. lxi,2; cxxviii,4; cf. Tat. Orat. v: κατὰ μερίδον, οὐ κατὰ ἀποκοπήν.

<sup>3</sup>Dial. cxxviii,4.

<sup>4</sup>Dial. cxxviii,4.

<sup>5</sup>ibid.

<sup>6</sup>Irenaeus, adv. Haer. I,7,2 et passim. See above p. 172.

Justin does not mention 'psychic substance',<sup>1</sup> but he frequently says that Christ came 'through' Mary.<sup>2</sup> We have seen above in a lengthy discussion that Justin held to the view that Christ was not a man like other men and that His blood was produced not by man, but by the power of God.<sup>3</sup> There is sufficient evidence to demonstrate that when Justin thought of the birth of Christ, his categories were Gnostic. It was this kind of thinking which led to the statement in the spurious work of Justin de Resurrectione: 'there are some who declare Jesus Christ did not come in flesh, but only as spirit and exhibited an appearance ( φαντασίαν ) of flesh.'<sup>4</sup> Justin's view of the Incarnation was nowhere as Docetic as this<sup>5</sup>; but it was throughout tinged with Gnostic colours.

We have discussed elsewhere the significance of the term Ἀνθρώπος applied to Christ and we concluded that this was of Gnostic influence. Whatever the link is between 'man' and 'Son of man' in later O.T. thinking and the precise meaning of  $\lambda\psi\gamma\gamma$ ,<sup>6</sup> we must agree with F.H. Borsch when he concludes after a thorough investigation of Justin's use of 'the Son of Man', that 'the plain fact of the matter is that Justin was not sure what this title did mean'.<sup>7</sup> He could not with any ease make good use of the numerous gospel logia concerning the Son of Man. Although he uses the title frequently, he is uncertain of its range of meanings. Except for Mark, viii,31, Justin avoids the Gospel traditions incorporating the Son of Man title and even here, he excludes the term from the logion in Dial. li,2, but includes it when he quotes the parallel passage in Luke, ix,22.<sup>8</sup> Apart from Justin (who uses the term frequently), the references to the Son of Man in the Apostolic

<sup>1</sup>cf. Dial. lxi,1: ὁ θεὸς γεγέννηκε σύναμιν τινα ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ λογικὴν.

<sup>2</sup>e.g. Dial. xlviii,2: γεγέννηται ἄνθρωπος διὰ τῆς παρθένου; ibid. lvii,3; c,3.

<sup>3</sup>See p. 170 ; e.g. I Apol. xxxii,11.

<sup>4</sup>ps.-Justin, de Resurr.2.

<sup>5</sup>cf. Dial. xcviii,1; xcix,2; ciii,8.

<sup>6</sup>For full bibliographies, see F.H. Borsch, The Christian and Gnostic Son of Man; R.N. Longenecker, The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity.

<sup>7</sup>F.H. Borsch, op.cit. p.49.

<sup>8</sup>Dial. lxxvi,7.



Fathers and early Apologists are very few. This is surprising in view of the appearance of the term in distinctive and highly significant contexts in the Gospels.<sup>1</sup>

A survey of the references shows that the Son of Man title was much more popular among Gnostic Christians and non-Christian Gnostics.<sup>2</sup> The usage of this title among the Gnostics was not directly dependent on the Son of Man sayings from the canonical gospels. We have noted that Justin is among such writers. Because of the few traces in more orthodox Christian writers of the early second century, who employed the term, we cannot believe that the Gnostics who used the expression borrowed it from the Christians.<sup>3</sup> The conclusion is that the significant number of Gnostic references to the Son of Man did not originate in the influence of canonical writings.<sup>4</sup> If this is pressed further, we can agree with Borsch that the Gnostic usage of the Son of Man title derives, in part, from forms of Christian tradition which then developed differently from those which eventually reached the canonical evangelists.<sup>5</sup> We cannot pursue this matter further. But Justin is part of this alternative tradition and in view of the fact that his confused usage of the Son of Man title is non-canonical, but in line with Gnostic usage, the conclusion is clear that he was himself under Gnostic influence.

The metaphysical concepts of Justin were indisputably Middle Platonist. When he wished to clothe his skeleton in flesh, his cosmology was that of the Gnostics. Not boldly as among the Valentinians, but pervasively. His range of ideas about God and about Christ, his use of non-biblical terms to describe their relationship, his employment of Middle Platonist terms in Gnostic ways all lead to the same conclusion that Justin had learned his Christianity in a milieu which did not lie in the generally accepted sense of mid-second century A.D. 'orthodoxy'. His use of the LXX to make his points to Trypho is extensive enough. But his Supreme God is unknowable and indescribable in the apophatic language of the Gnostics. Whenever an occurrence of

<sup>1</sup>F.H. Borsch op. cit. p.56.

<sup>2</sup>F.H. Borsch, op. cit. p.110 (with the relevant evidence).

<sup>3</sup>ibid. p.114.

<sup>4</sup>ibid.

<sup>5</sup>ibid.



God's physical appearance intervening in the O.T. takes place, Justin takes this to be a theophany of the Logos. The Logos is unmistakably God and there is no place in Justin's cosmology for the monotheism of the O.T. The O.T. God is not the sole God. Neither is He a personal God. He has a responsibility for creating and ruling; but there is no sense of Justin's seeing him as making a loving relationship with his creatures. Even the Fatherhood of God is linked with the fact that he creates rather than loves as a father. The appellatives of God are Gnostic terms, all the more so if we can equate  $\tau\acute{\alpha} \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha$  with the Pleroma. Justin's God is not very different from the God of many Gnostics. This God rules his pleroma with the help of angels who at some points in Justin's work seemed to be eternal and gave a hint of a dualism.

The saving power of Christ was exercised through His capacity and function as a teacher. This was felt to be redemption through gnosis. Certainly demons needed to be exorcised before salvation could be received. Through gnosis, the Christ-Logos revealed an Unknown God and as in all Gnostic systems, the Supreme, Unknowable God needed a Mediator. Again, these are salient points in the general plan of Gnostic systems.

We saw too that the catalogue of titles for Christ which occurred at intervals in Justin's works were reminiscent of the genealogies in the works of Gnostics and we saw that Justin escaped from the fragmentary effect of the Godhead in the works of the Gnostics by coalescing the titles into the one person of the Logos-Christ. Among the titles were several which could only be satisfactorily elucidated by acknowledging their use mainly and sometimes exclusively in Gnostic writings. Archon, Angel, Anthropos, Israel, Arche, and the usage of the Son of Man peculiar to Justin provided evidence. Christ in the final analysis was not a man as other men were for Justin. His blood (and therefore his soul) was not of men. The Logos himself was responsible for overshadowing Mary, as Power of God. We could only find Gnostic sources for this concept which Justin promulgated. Christ was born through Mary just as the Gnostics believed and there were several passages where Justin felt that Christ-Logos was also unknowable.

The evidence is considerable that Justin shared ideas with the Gnostics. If he started with his philosophical base of Middle Platonism with an unknowable Creator and a mediating Logos and if he found through his special interpretation of the O.T. that he could accommodate his eclectic Middle



Platonism to the O.T., as soon as he began to develop the super-structure of Christianity above his Platonist-O.T. foundation, he found that his own revelation and his own speculation were those of the Gnostics. Certainly, his Christian views were not those of the Synoptic writers nor those of St. John, nor those of St. Paul. His own tradition must have been extra-canonical. If his views were Gnostic, the level of toleration for Gnosticism among 'the orthodox Christians' must indeed have been very great. The conclusion is that in his day there could have been no orthodoxy and no accepted and unique tradition, no regula fidei.

### Conclusion

Admiration for the careful and patient scholarship of recent scholars like Goodenough, Barnard and Osborn must not obscure disagreement with their conclusions. These students of Justin saw him as a giant in a landscape of orthodoxy and accepted too a traditional view of Justin's position in credal history. While accepting Justin's undoubted significance among second century A.D. apologists, the present writer, at first tentatively, but latterly more surely was compelled to take up a more radical view than his predecessors in this field. At the outset of the present study, there seemed to be no place for doubt about the overwhelming dominance Middle Platonism had established in the centre of Justin's theology. At the end of our study therefore we could not be surprised at our failure to find in Justin firm evidence for the existence of a caring and intimate relationship between God and men or between God and His Son. The theophanies of the O.T. were not of God, but of the Logos and little crept into the writings of Justin to take from us an opinion that we were studying his own acceptance of God as one who was supreme, aloof, unreachable and supra-mundane. Although Justin subscribed to the concept of the moral laws of God, he expressed no profound insights into the nature of sin or of God's saving grace. He seemed to lack a belief in God as a loving Creator, compassionate and long suffering. Justin's God was the Supreme Principle of the Middle Platonists and if this God demonstrated the characteristic of goodness, this was none other than that which was to be found in the God of Middle Platonism too.

Salvation issued from a strict and retributive Judge and because it was based on a system of punishment and reward, there was little to differentiate such a system from that of higher paganism. Far from being familiar with the Gospel theme that God sent His Son into the world to redeem it, Justin seemed to think that all that was necessary for Salvation was a knowledge of God. Even where he employed the term Father, he used it to refer to His part in creation and where God was Father of the All, Justin seemed to take up a Gnostic view. There was a further indication that where he personalized God, he thought in terms of Anatolian sky gods. We could not avoid a conviction that the Christ Logos was subordinate to the Will of God. Consequently, we were drawn inescapably to a conclusion that Justin's God was Middle Platonist, Subordinationist and Gnostic.



When our study focussed on the Christ-Logos, we were unexpectedly disappointed to find an absence of a Descent of a Redeemer theme. Yet although a katabatic concept was absent, there was a good deal of evidence to indicate the belief in an anabatic Logos. A 'descent' was not essential for an Incarnation and if Justin had declared for this, his associations and parallels would have been found in overt Gnosticism. But the terminology which he used to describe the Incarnation drew upon the vocabulary of Middle Platonism. The entry of the pre-existent Logos-Christ into this world was an incarnation in terms of an entry from the world of Being into that of Becoming.

Justin nevertheless was on his guard and did not wish to describe a Gnostic Incarnation in terms of the descent of a Redeemer and as an emanation of an Unknowable God. Justin drew on the two strands of Judaism and Greek philosophy for a description of the Logos-Christ. Justin used Hellenistic terminology to refer to the theophany of the Logos-Christ, but he did not rest there. For he accepted that the pre-existent Christ in the time of Pilate was born of a virgin as a man and was crucified. He died and rose again. It is in this framework that his concept of Logos Spermatikos is to be analysed. In every man a seed of the Logos was implanted and when the Logos is considered as discharging the function of sowing this seed in every man, He was the Logos Spermatikos. This was a matter of function and not of a different hypostasis. The entire Logos principle came into being as Christ in body, in reason and in soul. And in whatever way the sages of old spoke well, resulted from the proportion of the Logos they possessed. All the terms which Justin used to describe man's share of the Logos were Platonist. Yet he was less committed to speculation on the cosmic function of the Logos than on the nature of the Son. Yet for all that, the mediator Logos projected itself into individuals in part and by sowing a seed, produced new life. The Logos Spermatikos was a transcendent figure and not an immanent revelation in every man.

An angelomorphic concept of the Logos-Christ was evident in Justin and his interpretation of many O.T. passages was of a theophany of an angelomorphic Logos. When we considered this and other characteristics like his use of asomatos to describe the nature of the Logos in the O.T. theophanies, we were led to Gnostic associations.

The more this study focussed on the relationship between the Father and the Son, the more a conclusion was confirmed that Justin's beliefs in the Sonship of Christ were without colour and that the relationship between Father and Son played an insignificant part in Salvation. He



expressed no doctrine about Man's reconciliation to God through Christ. Where Justin refers to Redemption, he either looks to God as Saviour or used a highly conventionalized title of Redeemer for Christ. Justin generally held to a penal substitution view of sacrifice where efficacious results were obtained from the Father by the manner of the sacrificial offering. There was greater stress on the exorcistic nature of the Son's sacrifice than on the spiritual gifts which might flow from it. The Cross signified a cosmic or cultic act, not unlike aspects of a taurobolium.

Christ, for Justin, was nevertheless a Mediator. He displayed the royal attributes of a Ruler, but at this point we remarked on the strong Gnostic associations of this role and there was a strong link with magic, exorcism and Gnostic imagery. The Logos-Christ performed all things through the will of God. It is God who reconciled, it is God who took control as far as the Parousia was concerned, and in building the new Jerusalem, the Logos-Christ was but the agent of the Supreme God. The death of Christ was necessary of itself, and not because it was consequent upon the irrefragable links with His Father. The Son was firmly in second place and was begotten of the Father only by the Father's will. He did not therefore, as the Word, possess from all eternity a separate existence from the Father.

Justin was far from solving the problem of how the Incarnation occurred. Time and time again, he states that this event took place by or through the will of God. Justin held to the view that the Son of the true God was in second place. He was indisputably subordinationist and if he really means that Jesus Christ was made flesh by the Word, he also showed Gnostic tendencies. The approach to the Father through Christ especially when linked with a name of magical significance added strength to such a claim.

Where the Christ-Logos also was given the name of Anthropos by Justin, we concluded that an assignation of royal mediatorship to Christ was tinged by Gnosticism especially where a catalogue of titles or names for Christ led us to recall Gnostic genealogies. And when we studied the personified nature of God's Glory, which we thought to be rather hypostatic, we found that it was actually given to Christ, further evidence of the subordinationism present in Justin. Possibly, nearly every Christology until the 4th century A.D. was more or less subordinationist and there is no need to find a particular label to hang on Justin. But Christ in the last resort was for Justin a minister



to the Father's will and begotten of the Father by the Father's will.

The evidence gradually mounted that Justin shared to a considerable degree ideas with Gnostics. This evidence was reviewed in the last chapter and it was convincing. Middle Platonism provided Justin with an unknowable Supreme God and the Logos as intermediary between the worlds of Being and Becoming. He accommodated his eclectic Middle Platonism to his understanding of the Old Testament. But when he was compelled to erect a superstructure above his Platonist-Old Testament footings, his hermeneutics and his cosmic understanding were closely allied with Gnostic thought. No N.T. writer seemed to have moulded Justin's concepts and it now seems obvious that his received tradition (if he was not completely original in his doctrine) must have been extra-canonical. It follows therefore that if Justin, one of the dominant figures of Christian development in the second century A.D., was as Gnostic to the degree we have suggested, the coefficient of toleration for Gnosticism among those once thought 'orthodox' Christians must have been remarkably high. Such a view has serious implications for claims to 'orthodoxy' in the second century A.D. This study of the relationship of the Son to the Father in Justin Martyr substantiates a claim that this relationship was not based on an intimate and personal association as it was defined in later doctrine.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

## I. Justin

### A. Editions

- |                |   |
|----------------|---|
| Stephanus      | Paris. 1551.  |
| Perionius      | Paris. 1554.  |
| Sylburgius     | Heidelberg. 1593. Paris. 1615, 1636.  |
| Grabius        | (Apol.I). Oxford. 1700.   |
| Hutchin        | (Apol.II). Oxford. 1703.  |
| Thirlby        | London. 1722.   |
| Maran          | Paris. 1742. Re-edited by Migne, 1857, 1884.  |
| Thalemann      | Leipzig. 1755.  |
| Ashton         | Cambridge. 1768.  |
| Braun          | Bonn. 1830. Re-edited by Gutberlet. Limburg. 1890.  |
| Trollope       | Cambridge. 1845.  |
| J.P. Migne     | Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Graeca. Paris 1857-1866 Tom.VI. 1857 (after Maran).  |
| J.C.T.S. Otto  | Justini Philosophi et Martyris Opera (Greek text with Latin translation). 3rd ed. Jena. 1876-9. Corp. Apol. I-V, repr. 1968.  |
| Veil           | Strassburg. 1894. (A German Translation).   |
| L. Pautigny    | Apologies. Texte grec, trad. franç. Paris. 1904.  |
| G. Rauschen    | Apologiae duae. Florilegium patristicum. Bonn. 1904. Fasc. alter.   |
| G. Archambault | Dial. avec. Tryph. Texte grec., trad. franco. introd. notes et index. Textes et documents pour l'étude historique du christianisme, vls. 8, 11. Paris 1909. (N.B. used by Bueno). |
| A.W.F. Blunt   | Cambridge. 1911. The text of the Apologies only. The edition follows mainly the text of Krüger. I have used the text of Blunt except where stated.                                |
| F. Cavallera   | Migne. Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Graeca. Indices digessit. Paris. 1912.  |
| E.J. Goodspeed | Die 'ältesten Apologeten. Texte mit kurzen Einleitungen. Göttingen. 1914. (Quadratus-Aristides-Justinus-Tatianus-Melito-Athenagoras).   |



- G. Krüger Die Apologien Justins des Martyrers. 3rd ed. Leipzig. 1915. Repr. 1968, Sammlung ausgewählter Quellenschriften.
- A.L. Williams The Dialogue with Trypho. Trans. Introd. Notes. London. 1930.
- W. Bauer Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum. Tübingen, 1934, p.23.
- D.R. Bueno Padres Apologistas Griegos. Madrid. 1954.
- K. Bayer Die erste Apologie. 1966.
- J.C.M. Van Winden An Early Christian Philosopher: Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho. Caps. I-IX. Introd. Text and Commentary. (1971). Leiden.

B. General.

- G. Aeby Les missions divines de Saint Justin à Origène. Freiburg. 1958.
- C. Andresen 'Justin und der mittlere Platonismus', Z.N.T.W. XLIV (1952-3), pp.157-95.  
Logos und Nomos. Berlin. 1955.
- G. Archambault Justin, Dialogue avec Tryphon. 2 vols. Paris. 1909.  
'Le témoignage de l'ancienne littérature chrétienne sur l'authenticité d'un  $\pi\epsilon\epsilon\iota$   $\alpha\upsilon\alpha\delta\tau\alpha\delta\epsilon\omega\varsigma$  attribué à Justin l'apologiste', R. de Philologie, xxix (1905), pp.73-93.
- G.T. Armstrong Die Genesis in der Alten Kirche. BGBH.4 (1962).  
passim.  
Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Hermeneutik (Tübingen).
- G. Bardy 'Saint Justin et la philosophie stoïcienne', R.S.R. xiii (1923), pp.493 ff.  
Recherches de Science Religieuse (Paris).
- L.W. Barnard 'Hadrian and Christianity', C.Q.R. CLXV (1964), pp.277-89.  
'The Old Testament and Judaism in the writings of Justin Martyr', V.T. XIV (1964), pp.395-406.  
'Justin Martyr's Eschatology', V.C. xix (1965), pp.86-98.  
Justin Martyr. His Life and Thought. Cambridge. 1967.

- A. Bellinzoni The sayings of Jesus in the Writings of Justin Martyr. Harvard thesis. 1962.
- A.W.F. Blunt The Apologies of Justin Martyr. Cambridge Patristic Texts. Cambridge 1911. vid. J. Quasten. Patrology. Generalia p.198, pp.210-211, pp.212-219. Editions p.201, 203. Translations p.201, 203. Studies, p.202, pp.203-204 (For the lost writings, pp.204-205.
- H. Chadwick 'Justin Martyr's Defence of Christianity', B.J.R.L. XLVII (1965), pp.275-97.  
Early Christian Thought and the Classical Tradition. Oxford. 1966.
- J.A. Cramer Die Logosstellen in Justins Apologien kritisch untersucht Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft. (1901), 300 ff.
- M. Dods et al The Writings of Justin Martyr and Athenagoras. (Ante-Nicene Christian Library). Edinburgh. 1867.
- M. von Engelhardt Das Christentum Justins des Märtyrers. Erlangen. 1878.
- A. Feder Justins des Märtyrers Lehre von Jesus Christus. Freiburg. 1906.
- J. Geffcken Zwei griechische Apologeten. Leipzig. 1907.
- B.L. Gildersleeve The Apologies of Justin Martyr. New York. 1877.
- M. Goguel L'Eucharistie des origines à Justin Martyr. Paris. 1910.
- A.H. Goldfahn Justinus Martyr und die Agada. Breslau. 1873.
- E.R. Goodenough The Theology of Justin Martyr. Jena. 1923.
- R.M. Grant 'Aristotle and the Conversion of Justin', Journal of Theological Studies 7 (1956) pp.246-48.
- A. von Harnack Die Überlieferung der griechischen Apologeten des 2 Jahrhunderts in der alten Kirche und im Mittelalter. T. and U. VII. Leipzig. 1882.  
Brod und Wasser, die eucharistischen Elemente bei Justin. T. and U. VII. Leipzig. 1891.  
The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries. Eng. Trans. Edinburgh. 1908.  
Judentum und Judenchristentum in Justins Dialog. mit Trypho. T. and U. XXXIX. Leipzig. 1913.



- R.H. Heard 'Apomnemoneumata in Papias, Justin and Irenaeus'. N.T.S. I (1954), pp.122-34.
- P. Heinisch Der Einfluss Philos auf die älteste christliche Exegese; Barnabas, Justin und Clemens von Alexandria. Münster. 1908.
- H.S. Holland 'Justinus Martyr'. D.C.B. III, pp.560-37.
- R. Holte Logos spermatikos, Christianity and Ancient Philosophy according to St. Justin's Apologies. Studia Theologica 12 Lund. 1958. pp.109-68.
- K. Hubik Die Apologien des hl. Justinus des Philosophen und Märtyrers. Vienna. 1912.
- N. Hyldahl Tryphon und Tarphon. Studia Theologica 10 (1956), pp.77-88.  
Philosophie und Christentum, Kopenhagen, 1966.
- P. Katz 'Justin's Old Testament Quotations and the Greek Dodekapropheton Scroll', Studia Patristica, I (Berlin, 1957), 343.
- J. Kaye Some Account of the Writings and Opinions of Justin Martyr. London 1836.  
The First Apology of Justin Martyr. London (no date).
- P. Keseling Justin's 'Dialog gegen Trypho' (c.1-10). N.F. 75 (1926), pp.223-229.
- B. Kominiak The Theophanies of the Old Testament in the Writings of Justin Martyr. Washington 1948.
- M.J. Lagrange Saint Justin, Philosophe, Martyr. 2nd ed. Paris. 1914.
- H. Leitzmann 'Justinus der Martyr' in Pauly-Wissowa, Real. Enc. X. cols. 1332-7. Stuttgart. 1919.
- C.C. Martindale Justin Martyr. London 1921.
- E.F. Osborn Justin's Response to Second Century Challenges. Australian Biblical Review. XIV 1966, pp.37-54.  
Justin Martyr. Tübingen. 1973.
- W. Pannenberg Die Aufnahme des philosophischen Gottesbegriffs als dogmatisches Problem des frühchristlichen Theologie. ZKG. 70 (1959) pp.1-45.  
Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte.

- J.M. Pfäffisch      Der Einfluss Platon auf die Theologie Justins  
des Märtyrers. Forschungen zur Christlichen  
Literatur und Dogmengeschichte, X (1910), Part I ,  
1 ff. Paderborn. 1910.  
Justinus des Philosophen und Märtyrers Apologien.  
Munich. 1912.
- E. Preuschen      'Die Echtheit von Justins Dial. gegen Tryphon'  
Z.N.T.W. (1919-20), pp.102-26.
- P. Prigent      Justin et l'Ancien Testament. Paris. 1964.
- G.T. Purves      The Testimony of Justin Martyr to Early Christianity  
London. 1888.
- N. Pycke      Connaissance rationnelle et connaissance de grace  
chez s. Justin. Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses.  
37 (1961) pp.52-85.
- G. Rauschen      Die Beiden Apologien Justins des Märtyrers.  
Kempton. 1913.
- J.S. Romanides      'Justin Martyr and the Fourth Gospel', Greek  
Orthodox Theological Review, IV (1958-59), 115-34.
- W. Schmid      Die Textüberlieferung der Apologie des Justin.  
ZNW XL (1941), p.87f.  
Frühe Apologetik und Platonismus, Ein Beitrag zur  
Interpretation des Proöms von Justin's Dialogus,  
Hermeneia. Festschrift für Otto Regenbogen.  
Heidelberg. 1952. pp.163-182.
- E. Seeburg      Die Geschichtstheologie Justins des Märtyrers.  
Kiel. 1939.  
Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte 58 (1939), 1-81.
- W.A. Shottwell      The Biblical Exegesis of Justin Martyr, London 1965.
- J.S. Sibinga      The Old Testament Text of Justin Martyr. I. The  
Pentateuch. Leiden. 1963.
- C.I.K. Story      The Nature of Truth in the Gospel of Truth and in  
the Writings of Justin Martyr. Supplement to Novum  
Testamentum. Leiden. 1971.
- J.H. Waszink      'Bemerkungen zu Justins Lehre vom Logos Spermatikos',  
Festschrift Theodor Klauser. Münster. 1964.  
pp.380-90.
- A.L. Williams      Justin Martyr: The Dialogue with Trypho. London.  
1930.



- P. Willm Justin Martyr et son apologétique. Montauban.  
1897.
- T. Zahn Studien zu Justinus Martyr. ZKG, 8 (1886),  
pp. 1-84.

## II. Select Studies

### The Dead Sea Scrolls

- J.M. Allegro The Dead Sea Scrolls, Harmondsworth, 1956.
- A.A. Anderson 'The Use of "Ruah" in IQS, IQH and IQM', Journal of Semitic Studies, vii (1962), pp. 293-303.
- M. Black The Scrolls and Christian Origins, London, 1961.
- M. Burrows 'The Dead Sea Scrolls. New York 1955.
- J.H. Charlesworth John and Qumran. London 1972.
- F.M. Cross The Ancient Library of Qumran. London 1958.
- J. Daniélou The Dead Sea Scrolls and Primitive Christianity.  
Baltimore 1962.
- G.R. Driver The Judaean Scrolls, Oxford, 1965.
- A. Dupont-Somner The Dead Sea Scrolls, Oxford, 1952.
- M. Philonenko Les Interpolations Chrétiennes des Testaments des  
Douze Patriarches et les Manuscrits de Qumran,  
Paris, 1960.
- H.H. Rowley The Dead Sea Scrolls and the N.T. London, 1957.
- G. Vermes The Dead Sea Scrolls in English, Harmondsworth,  
1962.
- P. Wernberg-Møller 'A Reconsideration of the Two Spirits in the Rule  
of the Community. IQS 3. 13-4. 26'. Revue de  
Qumran, iii (1961), pp. 413-41.

Dictionaries, Encyclopaedias etc.

W. Bauer

Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur. 1963.

A Greek-English Lexicon of the N.T. and other Early Christian Literature, trans. and ed. by W.F. Arndt and F.W. Gingrich. 1956.

Bibliographie

zur Jüdisch-Hellenistischen und intertestamentarischen Literatur 1900-1965. In Verbindung mit G. Zischhuber und H. Berthold. Hrg. V.G. Delling. (Texte und Untersuchung). 1969.

R. Cagnat

Inscriptiones Graecae ad Res Romanas pertinentes, Paris, 1911-14.

Cambridge Ancient History

Catalogus Codicum

Vols. I-XII, 1898-1953.

Astrologorum

Graecorum.

Catalogue

of the Greek Papyri in the John Rylands Library, Manchester I ed. A.S. Hunt; II edd. J. de M. Johnson, V. Martin, A.S. Hunt. Manchester 1911-15. New York. 1907-1914.

The Catholic Encyclopedia.

C. Clemen

Fontes historiae religionum, Berlin, 1920-1939.

R.G. Collingwood and

The Roman Inscriptions of Britain, Vol. I. Oxford. 1965.

R.P. Wright

S.A. Cook,

The Cambridge Ancient History. 1963.

F.E. Adcock,

M.P. Charlesworth.

Corpus Inscriptionum

Berlin, 1828-77.

Graecarum.

Corpus Inscriptionum

E. Hübner, 1873.

Latinarum.

Corpus Scriptorum

Vienna, 1866-.

Ecclesiasticorum

Latinorum.

H. Dessau

Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae. 1892-1916.

Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae. Berlin, 1954-55.



W. Dittenberger

Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae. Leipzig.  
1903-05.

Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum. 3rd ed. Leipzig.  
1915-24.

I. Epstein

The Babylonian Talmud, trans. and ed. Soncino  
edition. 34 vols and Index. London 1935-52.

The Flinders Petrie  
Papyri

edd. J.P. Mahaffy and J.G. Smyly. 3 vols.  
1891-1905.

C. Gore

A New Commentary on Holy Scripture, London, 1928.

M. Grant

Roman History from Coins, Cambridge, 1958.

Greek Papyri in  
the British Museum

edd. F.G. Kenyon and H.I. Bell, London, 1893-1917.

J. Hastings

Dictionary of the Apostolic Church. Edinburgh.  
1915-18.

Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible edd. J. Hastings,  
J.A. Selbie et al. 5 vols. Edinburgh 1900-04 (Revised  
edition, edd. F.C. Grant and H.H. Rowley 1962).

Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics. 13 vols.  
Edinburgh, 1908.

E. Hatch and  
H.A. Redpath.

A Concordance to the Septuagint. Oxford, 1897.  
repr. Graz. 1954.

Inscriptiones  
Graecae.

Editio Maior 1873-1939; Editio Minor (revised)  
1913-40.

The International  
Critical Commentary

edd. S.R. Driver, A. Plummer, C.A. Briggs, Edinburgh,  
1930.

M. Jastrow

A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and  
Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature, London 1903.

Jewish Encyclopaedia  
B.J. Kidd

edd. I. Singer et al. 12 vols. New York 1901-06.  
Documents Illustrative to the History of the Church.  
Vol. I to A.D. 313. London and New York. 1938.

G. Kittel

Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament.  
Stuttgart. 1932-.

G.H.W. Lampe

Theological Dictionary of the N.T. trans. G.W. Bromiley.  
A Patristic Greek Lexicon 1968.

J. Lemprière

Classical Dictionary of Proper Names mentioned in  
Classical Authors. Rev. ed. by F.A. Wright. London  
1949.

- Liddell and Scott      Greek-English Lexicon. rev. H. Stuart Jones and R. Mackenzie 1954.
- J. Marouzeau      L'année philologique. Bibliographie critique et analytique de l'antiquité gréco-latine. Paris 1926-.
- J.H. Moulton and G. Milligan.      The Vocabulary of the Greek N.T. 1952.
- J.A. Nairn      Classical Handlist ed. B.H. Blackwell. Oxford 1953 pp.72-75.
- M.P. Nilsson      Geschichte der Griechischen Religion, 2 vols. (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft V,2) Munich, 1941-50.
- Oxyrhynchus Papyri.      edd. B.P. Grenfell, A.S. Hunt et al. London 1898-1927.
- Paris Papyri      in Notices et Extraits, xviii,ii ed. Brunet de Presle, Paris, 1865.
- Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll.      Realenzyklopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft Stuttgart 1893-
- F. Preisigke.      Namenbuch enthaltend alle Menschnennamen Ägyptens sich vorfinden. Heidelberg. 1922.
- W.H. Roscher      Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Aegypten. Ausführliches Lexicon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie 1884-1937.
- M.H. Segal      A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew, Oxford 1927.
- E.M. Smallwood      Documents Illustrating the Principates of Nerva, Trajan and Hadrian. Cambridge 1966.
- W. Smith and H. Wace      Dictionary of Christian Biography, Literature, Sects and Doctrines. London 1877-87.
- Soncino Books of the Bible with pointed Hebrew text.      English translation and Commentary ed. A. Cohen.
- H. Stephanus      Thesaurus linguae graecae. Paris. 1831-65.
- W.B. Stevenson      Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic. Oxford 1924.
- H.L. Strack and P. Billerbeck.      Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch. 5 vols. Munich 1922-28. Index 1956.
- Texts and Studies.      Contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature. ed. J. Armitage Robinson. Cambridge. 1st series. 1891-1952; New series ed. C.H. Dodd. 1954-.
- G. Wissowa      Religion und Kultus der Römer. Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft. Vol. IV. Munich. 1912.



Classical Philosophy

- D.J. Allan                   The Philosophy of Aristotle. London and Oxford.  
1970.
- A.H. Armstrong            An Introduction to Ancient Philosophy, London,  
1965.  
The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early  
Mediaeval Philosophy. Cambridge 1966.
- A.H. Armstrong and  
R.A. Markus               Christian Faith and Greek Philosophy. London 1960.
- J. Von Arnim               Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta, Vols. I-III. Leipzig.  
1903-05. Vol. IV. Indices by M. Adler. Leipzig. 1924.
- E.V. Arnold                Roman Stoicism, Cambridge 1911; reprinted London,  
1958.
- C. Bigg                    The Christian Platonists of Alexandria. Oxford.  
2nd ed. 1913.
- E. Bréhier                 Histoire de la Philosophie. Vol. I. L'Antiquité.  
2 pts. Paris. 1926-27.  
La philosophie de Plotin. Paris. 1928.
- J. Burnet                  Platonism. Berkeley, California. 1928.  
Early Greek Philosophy. 4th ed. London. 1930.
- F.C. Copleston            A History of Philosophy. Vol. I. Greece and Rome.  
Rev. ed. London, 1947.
- F.M. Cornford             Plato's Cosmology. Cambridge, 1937 ("Timaeus"  
translated with commentary).
- I.M. Crombie              An Examination of Plato's Doctrines 2 vols. London.  
1962.
- H. Diels                   Fragmente der Vorsokratiker, 3 vols. 10th ed.  
revised by W. Kranz. Berlin 1961.
- D.R. Dudley               A History of Cynicism, London, 1937.
- L. Edelstein               'The Philosophical System of Poseidonius', Amer.  
Journal of Philol. lvii (1936), pp.286-325.
- A.S.L. Farquharson        The Meditations of the Emperor Marcus Antoninus  
with English trans.) Oxford 1944 (2 vols).  
Marcus Aurelius. His Life and His World ed. by  
D.A. Rees, Oxford 1951.
- G.M.A. Grube              Plato's Thought. London repr. 1970.

- W.K.C. Guthrie      The Greeks and their Gods, London, 1950.  
In the Beginning. Some Greek Views on the origins  
of the life and the early state of man. London.  
1957.
- C.F. Hermann      Platonis Dialogi. Vol. VI. Leipzig. 1892.
- R.D. Hicks      Stoic and Epicurean. Cambridge 1910.
- W.R. Inge      The Philosophy of Plotinus, London 1928 (reprinted  
1948), 2 vols.
- W. Jaeger      Aristotle. Fundamentals of the History of His  
Development. 2nd ed. revised. Eng. trans. by  
R. Robinson. Oxford. 1948.
- R.M. Jones      The Platonism of Plutarch. Chicago 1916.
- N. Maccoll      The Greek Sceptics from Pyrrho to Sextus, London  
and Cambridge 1869.
- P. Merlan      From Platonism to Neoplatonism. The Hague 2nd. ed.  
1960.
- M. Patrick      Sextus Empiricus and Greek Scepticism, Cambridge  
1889.
- Plotinus      Ennéades ed. R. Volkmann, Leipzig 1884, 2 vols.  
Ennéades. Text and French translation by E. Bréhier.  
Paris 1924-1938, 6 vols (Bude) Plotini Opera edd.  
P. Henry et H.-R. Schwyzer, Vol. I, Paris-Brussels  
1951; Vol. II 1959. Plotinus. ed. A.H. Armstrong.  
London. 1966.
- K. Reinhardt      'Poseidonios', Pauly-Wissowa, RE Vol. xxii,1, col.  
558-826 (1953) with an excellent bibliography  
(col. 559-563).
- J.M. Rist      Stoic Philosophy. Cambridge. 1969.
- H. Ritter and      Historia Philosophiae Graecae, Gotha, 1934.
- L. Preller
- W.D. Ross      Aristotle. Rev. ed. London. 1930.
- H. Schenkl      Marcus Aurelius. Leipzig. 1913 (Teubner).
- D.S. Sharp      Epictetus and the New Testament, London 1914.
- J. Shiel      Greek Thought and the Rise of Christianity, London.  
1968.
- J.L. Stocks      Aristotelianism. Our debt to Greece and Rome 1925.



- A.E. Taylor Aristotle. 2nd. ed. London 1919.  
Plato (Philosophies Ancient and Modern) 1922.  
Platonism (Our Debt to Greece and Rome) 1924.  
Plato: the Man and his Work 3rd.ed. Oxford 1929.
- C.J. Vogel Greek Philosophy Leiden Vol. I. Thales to Plato.  
3rd ed. 1963. Vol. II Aristotle, the Early  
Peripatetic School and the Early Academy, 2nd ed.  
1960. Vol. III The Hellenistic-Roman Period.  
Vol. III especially contains much textual material  
difficult to obtain from other sources.
- T. Whittaker The Neoplatonists, Cambridge 1918; repr. 1928,  
1961, pp.40-106.
- R.E. Witt 'Plotinus and Posidonius', Classical Quarterly  
(1930) pp.198-207.  
Albinus and the History of Middle Platonism.  
Cambridge. 1937.
- E. Zeller Stoics, Epicureans and Sceptics. Eng. translation  
from Vol. III of Philosophie d. Griechen, by  
O. Reichel. London, 1880.  
Outlines of Greek Philosophy. Eng. translation of  
13th ed. by W. Nestle, S.F. Alleyne, E. Abbott.  
New ed. rev. London, 1931.

### Gnosticism

- F.H. Borsch The Christian and Gnostic Son of Man. London 1970.
- F.C. Burkitt Church and Gnosis. Cambridge. 1932.
- R.P. Casey 'The Study of Gnosticism', Journal of Theological  
Studies, 36 (1935), pp.45-60.
- C.J. De Catanzaro 'The Gospel According to Philip' Journal of  
Theological Studies, xiii (1962), pp.35-71 (Eng.  
trans. of the Coptic text).
- J.H. Charlesworth and R.A. Culpepper 'The Odes of Solomon and the Gospel of John'. The  
Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 35 (3,1973), pp.  
298-322.
- F.L. Cross (trans. and ed.) The Jung Codex. London, 1955.
- C.H. Dodd The Bible and the Greeks, London 1964.
- J. Doresse The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics. London.  
1960.  
'A Gnostic Library', Archaeology, iii(1950), pp.  
69-73.

- E. De Faye  
A.J. Festugière  
Gnostiques et gnosticisme. Paris 2nd ed.1925.  
La révélation d'Hermes Trismégiste Vols. I-IV,  
1949-54.
- W. Foerster  
Gnosis. A Selection of Gnostic Texts. Eng.Trans.  
R. McL. Wilson. 2 vols. Oxford. 1972-74.
- B. Gartner  
The Theology of the Gospel of Thomas. Eng. Trans.  
by E.J. Sharpe. London. 1961.
- S. Giversen  
'Evangelium Veritatis and the Epistle to the  
Hebrews', Studia Theologica, xiii (1959),  
pp. 87-96.  
Apocryphon Johannis (Acta Theologica Danica, V),  
Copenhagen, 1963, (Text with Eng. trans.).
- R.M. Grant  
Second-century Christianity, London, 1957.  
Gnosticism and Early Christianity. New York 1959.  
Gnosticism; an Anthology, London, 1961.  
After the N.T., Philadelphia, 1967.
- K. Grabel  
The Gospel of Truth: A Valentinian Meditation  
on the Gospel. New York 1960.
- A. Guillaumont,  
H. Puech et al.  
W.W. Isenberg  
The Gospel according to Thomas. Coptic text and  
Eng. trans. Leiden. 1959.  
Translation of the Gospel of Truth in Gnosticism:  
A Source Book of Heretical Writings ed. R.M. Grant.  
New York. 1961.
- H. Jonas  
G.W. Mackae  
The Gnostic Religion, Boston, 1963.  
'Gnosticism and N.T. Studies', Bible Today,  
xxxviii (1968), pp.2623-30.
- L.H. Martin  
The Anti-philosophical Polemic and Gnostic  
Soteriology in the 'Treatise on the Resurrection',  
Numen 20 (1,73) pp.20-37.
- A.D. Nock  
Corpus Hermeticum. Vols. I-IV. French trans. by  
A.J. Festugière. Paris. 1945-54.
- A.D. Nock and  
A.J. Festugière  
S. Pétrement  
Hermes Trismégiste, I-IV, Paris, 1945-54.
- J. Quasten  
'Le Colloque de Messine et le problème du  
gnosticisme', Revue Metaphysique et de Morale,  
lxxvi (1967), no.3, pp.344-373.  
Patrology, pp.256-257,259,261,271-272,276-277.



- G. Quispel 'The original doctrine of Valentine', Vigiliae Christianae, I (1947), pp.43-73.
- J.M. Robinson 'The Coptic Gnostic Library Today', New Testament Studies, xiv (1968), no.3. pp.356-401.
- L. Gordon Rylands The Beginnings of Gnostic Christianity. London 1940.
- W.C. Till Das Evangelium nach Philippos. Berlin. 1963.
- W. Völker Quellen zur Geschichte der christlichen Gnosis. Tübingen. 1932.
- R.M. Wilson The Gnostic Problem, London, 1958.
- Studies in the Gospel of Thomas, London, 1960.
- 'Thomas and the Growth of the Gospel', Harvard Theological Review, liii (1960), pp.231-250.
- 'Thomas and the Synoptic Gospels' Expository Times, lxxii (1960), pp.36-39.
- The Gospel of Philip. Trans. from Coptic text. London. 1962.
- Gnosis and the New Testament. Oxford. 1968.
- 'Gnostic Origins', Vigiliae Christianae, 9 (1955), pp.193-211.

#### History of Ancient Christian Literature

- B. Altaner Patrologie. 5th ed. Freiburg 1950. Eng. trans. H.C. Graef 1960. Full references to newer bibliographies occur in the various editions.
- O. Bardenhewer Patrologie. 3rd ed. Freiburg. 1910. Eng. trans. (2nd ed) J.J. Shahan. Freiburg and St. Louis. 1908.
- Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur. Freiburg. 1913-1932. 5 vols.
- G. Bardy Littérature grecque chrétienne. Paris.1928.
- Littérature latine chrétienne. Paris.1929.
- F. Cayré Précis de Patrologie. Paris 1927-1930, (2 vols.). Eng. trans. H. Howitt. Paris 1936-1940.
- A. Harnack Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bis auf Eusebius. Leipzig. 1893-1904 (2 vols. in 3).
- G. Krueger Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten. 2nd ed. Freiburg 1898.
- Eng. trans. (1st ed.) C.R. Gillet. New York. 1897.

- P. de Labriolle      Histoire de la littérature latine chrétienne.  
Paris 1924. Eng. trans. H. Wilson. London 1924.  
3rd ed. G. Bardy. Paris 1947.
- P. Monceaux      Histoire de la littérature latine chrétienne.  
Paris 1924.
- A. Puech      Histoire de la littérature grecque chrétienne.  
Paris 1928.
- W. Schneemelcher      Bibliographia Patristica 1956-.  
Berlin 1959-.
- O. Stählin      Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller  
der ersten drei Jahrhunderte. Leipzig. 1905-60.
- W.N. Stearns      A Manual of Patrology. New York 1899.
- H.B. Swete      Patristic Study. London. 1902.
- Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur.  
1882. Berlin Academy.
- Texts and Studies      1st Series ed. J.A. Robinson. Cambridge 1-10.  
1891-1952; New Series. Ed. C.H. Dodd. Cambridge.  
1954-.
- F.A. Wright      A History of Later Greek Literature. London 1932.

### Judaism

- J. Abelson      The Immanence of God in Rabbinic Literature.  
London 1912.
- L. Baeck      Judaism and Christianity, New York. 1958.
- J. Bowker      The Targums and Rabbinic Literature. Cambridge.  
1969.
- Dcm. G. Dix      Jew and Greek, London, 1955.
- D. Daube      The N.T. and Rabbinic Judaism. 2nd ed. London.  
1956.
- W.D. Davies      Paul and Rabbinic Judaism. 2nd ed. London 1955.
- I. Epstein      Judaism. Harmondsworth, 1959.
- R. Travers Hereford      Christianity in Talmud and Midrash. London 1903.  
Talmud and Apocrypha. London 1933.
- R. Loewe      'The Jewish Midrashim and Patristic and Scholastic  
Exegesis of the Bible', Studia Patristica 1 =  
Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der  
altchristlichen Literatur, 63 (1957), 492 ff.



- C.G. Montefiore      Rabbinic Literature and Gospel Teachings.  
London 1930.  
The Synoptic Gospels. 2 vols. London 1927.
- G.F. Moore      Judaism. 3 vols. Cambridge, Mass. 1932.  
Index 1940.
- W.O.E. Oesterley and      A Short Survey of the Literature of Rabbinical  
G.H. Box      and Mediaeval Judaism. London. 1937.
- C. Pearl and      A Guide to Jewish Knowledge, London, 1965.
- R. Brookes
- S. Schechter      Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology, London 1909.
- R.A. Stewart      Rabbinic Theology, Edinburgh and London, 1961.
- C. Tresmontant      A Study of Hebrew Thought, (trans. M.F. Gibson),  
New York, 1960.

### Philo

- N. Bentwich      Philo Judaeus, Philadelphia, 1910.
- E. Bréhier      Les idées philosophiques et religieuses de Philon  
d'Alexandrie. Paris 1907; 1924; reprinted 1950.
- J. Drummond      Philo Judaeus, or the Jewish-Alexandrian philosophy  
in its development and completion. London 1880.  
2 vols. Reprint 1969.
- E.R. Goodenough      By Light Light. Yale 1935.  
Introduction to Philo Judaeus, New Haven 1940.
- E.R. Goodenough and      The Politics of Philo Judaeus, New Haven 1938  
H.L. Goodhart      (with a general bibliography of Philo).
- P. Katz      Philo's Bible. Cambridge. 1950.
- H. Leisegang      Philon in Pauly-Wissowa, R.E. XX,1,1-50 (1941).
- H. Lewy      Philo. Edited Selections. Philosophia Judaica.  
Oxford. 1946.
- E.I. Watkins      'New Light on Philo', Downside Review, lxxviii  
(1968), no.284, pp.287-297.
- H.A. Wolfson      Philo. 2 vols. Cambridge (Mass) 1948.  
See also E.R. Goodenough, 'Wolfson's Philo',  
Journal of Bibl. Litt. 1948, p.87. H. Chadwick,  
Classical Review, 1949, 24ff. J. Daniélou, Revue  
de l'histoire des religions, 1950, p.230. R. Marcus,  
'Wolfson's Revaluation of Philo', The Review of  
Religion, 1949, pp.368-381.

## General Bibliography



- E. Beurlier      Le culte impérial. Paris. 1891.
- E.R. Bevan      Stoics and Sceptics. Oxford. 1913.
- Symbolism and Belief. (Gifford Lectures. 1933-34). London. 1938.
- T.H. Bindley      The Oecumenical Documents of the Faith. 4th ed., rev. by F.W. Green. London. 1950.
- M. Black      'The Eschatology of the Similitudes of Enoch', Journal of Theological Studies, iii (1952), pp.1-10.
- An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, Oxford, 1967.
- The Scrolls and Christian Origins, Edinburgh, 1961.
- 'The Son of Man Problem in Recent Research and Debate'. Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, Vol. 45 (1962-63), pp.305-318.
- 'The Semitic Element in the N.T.' The Expository Times, lxxvii (1965), pp.20-23.
- M. Bodkin      Archetypal Patterns in Poetry. London 1934.
- Studies of Type-Images in Poetry. Religion and Philosophy. London. 1951.
- Th. Boman      Hebrew Thought compared with Greek, Eng. trans. J.L. Moreau, London, 1960.
- 'Hebrew and Greek Thought Forms in the N.T.' Current Issues in N.T. Interpretation, ed. W. Klassen and G.F. Snyder, pp.1-22, London 1962.
- J. Bonsirven      Le Judaïsme Palestinien au temps de Jésus-Christ, Paris, 1934-35.
- F.H. Borsch      'Forward and backward from W. Bousset's Kyrios Christos', Religion 3 (1,1973), pp.63-73.
- W. Bousset      Kyrios Christos (1965) (Eng. tr. J.E. Steely, 1970).
- S.G.F. Brandon      Jesus and the Zealots: a study of the political factor in primitive Christianity, 1967.
- C.A. Briggs      Messianic Prophecy. Edinburgh. 1886.
- L.H. Brockington      'The Septuagintal Background to the N.T. Use of doxa' Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R.H. Lightfoot. ed. D.E. Nineham, (Oxford, 1955), pp.1-8.

- R. Bultmann                   Theology of the N.T. Eng. trans. K. Grobel.  
London, 1952-55.
- F.C. Burkitt                  Early Eastern Christianity, London, 1904.  
Church and Gnosis, Cambridge, 1932.
- C.F. Burney                  The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel.  
Oxford. 1922.
- H. von Campenhausen        The Fathers of the Greek Church. London 1963.
- P. Carrington                The Primitive Christian Catechism. Cambridge.  
1940.  
The Early Christian Church. 2 vols. Cambridge  
1957.
- L. Cerfaux et  
J. Tondriaux                Le Culte des Souverains dans la civilisation  
Gréco-romaine. 1958.
- H. Chadwick                 Contra Celsum. Eng. Trans. Cambridge. 1953.
- R.H. Charles                Book of Enoch. Oxford. 1893.  
The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the O.T.  
in English, Oxford. 1913.  
The Apocalypse of Baruch. London. 1917.
- J.H. Charlesworth          John and Qumran. London. 1972.
- M.A. Chevallier            L'Esprit et le Messie dans le bas-Judaïsme et  
le Nouveau Testament. Paris 1958.
- J.C. Coetzee                'Christ and the prince of this world in the  
Gospel and the Epistles of St. John',  
Neotestamentica 2 (1968), pp.104-121.
- H. Conzelmann              History of Primitive Christianity. (Eng. trans.  
J.E. Steely. London. 1972).
- A.B. Cook                   Zeus: a Study in Ancient Religion, Cambridge,  
1914-1940.
- F.L. Cross                  The Early Christian Fathers, London, 1960.
- F. Cumont                  Textes et monuments figurés relatifs aux mystères  
de Mithra, Paris, 1895-99.  
Les Religions Orientales dans le Paganisme Romain.  
Paris, 1929. Eng. trans. (slightly abridged) 1956.  
Supplément à la Revue de l'instruction publique  
en Belgique, 1897 (Brussels).  
The Mysteries of Mithra. Trans. from the 2nd rev.  
French ed. by T.J. McCormack (1903). Chicago, 1911.



- J. Daniélou 'Trinité et Angelogie dans la Theologie judéo-chrétienne', Recherches de Science Religieuse, XLV (1957), pp.5-41.  
'Bulletin d'histoire des origines chretiennes', Recherches de Science religieuse (Paris), lvi (1969), no.1, pp.75-130.  
The Theology of Jewish Christianity. Trans. J.A. Baker, London, 1964.  
Gospel Message and Hellenistic Culture. London. 1973.
- A.B. Davidson Theology of the O.T. Edinburgh, 1904.
- W.D. Davies Christian Origins and Judaism, London, 1962.
- A. Deissman Bible Studies. Trans. A. Grieve. Edinburgh 1901.  
Licht von Osten. Tübingen, 1909.  
Light from the Ancient East. Trans. L.R.M. Strachan. London 1927.
- C.H. Dodd The Bible and the Greeks. London. 1935.  
According to the Scriptures. London. 1952.  
The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. Cambridge. 1953.  
Historical Tradition and the Fourth Gospel. Cambridge. 1964.
- E.R. Dodds Pagan and Christian in an Age of Anxiety, Cambridge, 1965.
- A. Ehrhardt The Beginning. Manchester. 1968.
- A.J. Festugière Personal Religion among the Greeks. Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1960.
- F.V. Filson The N.T. against its Environment. Studies in Biblical Theology No.3. London. 1963.
- H. Freedmann and M. Simon Midrash Rabbah, in English, 10 vols. Soncino edition, London 1939.
- W.H.C. Frend Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church. Oxford. 1965.
- R.H. Fuller The Mission and Achievement of Jesus, London, 1954.  
The N.T. in Current Study, London, 1963.  
The Foundations of N.T. Christology, London and Glasgow, 1965. Re-issued 1969 (paper).

- H.S. Gehman 'The Hebraic Character of Septuagint Greek',  
Vetus Testamentum, i (1951), pp.81-90.
- G. Gerleman Studies in the Septuagint, i. Job (Lund, 1946);  
ii. Proverbs (Lund, 1956).
- L. Ginzberg The Legends of the Jews. Trans. from the German  
ms. (Philadelphia 1909-1938) Vol. VII pp.586-598.
- T.R. Glover The Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman  
Empire, Chap. III 'Plutarch', pp.75-112 et  
passim, London, 1909.
- A.H. Goldfahn Justinus Martyr und die Agada, Monatsschrift  
für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums  
Vol. 22 (1873), pp.49-60 et passim.  
49-60, 104-115, 145-153, 194-202, 257-269.
- E.R. Goodenough By Light, Light. Newhaven 1969 (reprint).
- R.M. Grant Second Century Christianity, London, 1957.  
After the N.T. Philadelphia, 1967.  
'Jewish Christianity at Antioch in the Second  
Century' Recherches de Science Religieuse 60  
(1, 1972) pp.97-108.
- B.P. Grenfell and A.S. Hunt Apocalypse of Baruch (= II Baruch). Fragments  
published in B.P. Grenfell and A.S. Hunt,  
Oxyrhynchus Papyri, iii, 3-7 (1903); reprinted  
in this volume, p. 487 sqq.
- A. Grillmeier Christ in Christian Tradition, trans. by  
J.S. Bowden. London 1965. Rev. ed. 1975.
- J. Gross La Divinisation du Chrétien d'après les pères  
grecs. Paris. 1938.
- Ch. Guignebert Des prophètes à Jesus. Le monde juif vers le  
temps de Jésus. Nouv. éd. 1969.  
The Jewish World in the time of Jesus. Trans.  
S.H. Hooke. London. 1939.
- W.K.C. Guthrie The Greeks and their Gods. London. 1950.  
Orpheus and Greek Religion. London 1952.
- M. Hadas Hellenistic Culture, New York and Oxford, 1959.
- F. Hahn Christologische Hoheitstitel. Gottingen (1964);  
(Eng. trans. H. Knight and G. Ogg, The Titles  
of Jesus in Christology. London. 1969).



- N.Q. Hamilton 'The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in Paul',  
Occasional Papers, Scottish Journal of  
Theology, vi, Edinburgh, 1957.
- R.P.C. Hanson Allegory and event. London. 1959.  
Tradition in the Early Church. London 1962.  
The Attractiveness of God. London 1973.
- A. Harnack 'Der angebliche Evangelienkommentar des  
Theophilus von Antiochien', Texte und  
Untersuchungen i, p.4, Leipzig, 1883.  
'Theophilus von Antiochen und das Neue  
Testament', Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte.  
xi (1890), pp.1-21.
- E. Hennecke N.T. Apocrypha. 2 vols. Eng. Trans.  
R. McL. Wilson. Gt. Britain. 1973-74.
- T. Henshaw N.T. Literature. London. 1963.
- C. Fr. Hermann Albinus. Prologus et Didascalicus (= Epitome)  
ap. C. Fr. Hermann, Platonis Dialogi, Vol. VI,  
Leipzig, 1853, pp.152-189.
- I. Hermann, Studien zur Christologie der paulinischen  
Kyrios und Hauptbriefe, Munich, 1961.  
Pneuma:
- D. Hill Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings. Cambridge 1967.
- H. Hobein Maximus Tyrius. Philosophumena. Leipzig. 1908.  
Anonymer Kommentar zu Platons Theaetet.  
Leipzig. 1910.
- E.C. Hoskyns The Fourth Gospel, London, 1940.
- H.W. Household Rome, Republic and Empire. 1938.
- P. van Imschoot 'L'esprit de Yahvé, source de vie dans l'ancien  
Testament', Revue Biblique, xliv (1935),  
pp. 481-501.  
'Sagesse et Esprit dans l'ancien Testament',  
Revue Biblique, xlvii (1938), pp.23-49.
- E. Jacob Theology of the O.T. London, 1958.
- W. Jaeger Early Christianity and Greek Paideia. London 1962.
- M.R. James The Greek Apocalypse of Baruch (= III Baruch).  
Cambridge Texts and Studies, vol. V, No.1.  
Apocrypha Anecdota, iii, 1897.  
The Apocryphal N.T. Oxford, 1963.

- M. Jastrow      Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi and the Midrashic Literature. London and New York. 1903.
- E.G. Jay      Son of Man, Son of God. London, 1965.
- A.R. Johnson      Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel, Cardiff 1955.  
The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God. 2nd ed. Cardiff, 1961.
- M. de Jonge      'Jewish Expectations about the Messiah according to the Fourth Gospel' N.T. Studies 19 (3, 1973), pp. 246-270.
- J. Juster      Les Juifs dans l'empire romain. Paris. 1914.
- J.N.D. Kelly      Early Christian Doctrines, London, 1965.  
Early Christian Creeds, London, 1960.
- H.A.A. Kennedy      St. Paul and the Mystery Religions, London 1913.  
Philo's Contribution to Religion, London 1919.
- E. Klostermann and A. Harnack      The Apocryphal New Testament. Texts. Apocrypha I (Kleine Texte 3) 3rd ed. Bonn, 1921; II (Kleine Texte 8) 2nd ed. Bonn, 1910; III (Kleine Texte 11) 2nd ed. Bonn 1911; IV (Kleine Texte 12) 2nd ed. Bonn 1912.
- W.L. Knox      'The Divine Wisdom', Journal of Theological Studies, xxxviii (July) 1937.  
St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, Cambridge, 1939.
- A.T. Kraabel      'hypsistos and the Synagogue at Sardis', Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies, X (1969), no.1. pp. 81-93.
- S. Krauss      'The Jews in the Works of the Church Fathers', Jewish Quarterly Review Vol.5. (1892-1893) pp. 122-157. Vol.6 (1893-1894) pp.82-99. 225-261. Church Fathers.  
Article in Jewish Encyclopaedia Vol. IV (1906) pp. 80-86.
- E. Lamirande      Étude Bibliographique sur les pères de l'Eglise et L'Aggadah.  
Vigiliae Christianae. Vol. 21 (1967) pp.1-11.



- G.W.H. Lampe      The Seal of the Spirit, London, 1951.  
'The Holy Spirit in the Writings of St. Luke',  
Studies in the Gospels ed. D.E. Nineham,  
pp. 159-200, Oxford, 1955.
- M.L. Laistner      Christianity and pagan culture in the later  
Roman empire. Ithaca (New York). 1951.
- C. Larcher      Etudes sur le livre de la Sagesse. Paris 1969.
- J. Lawson      The Biblical Theology of Saint Irenaeus.  
London. 1948.
- A.R.C. Leaney      A Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Luke.  
London. 1966.
- J. Lebreton      Histoire du dogme de la Trinité, vol. ii, Paris,  
1928, pp.508-513.
- J. Lebreton and  
J. Zeiller      The History of the Primitive Church. Eng. Trans.  
2 vols. Paris. 1934-5.
- C.S. Lewis      The Allegory of Love, London, 1938.
- S. Liebermann      Greek in Jewish Palestine, New York. 1942.
- H. Lietzmann      The History of the early Church. Trans. B. Woolf.  
London. 3rd ed. 1953.
- B. Lindars      'New Books on John', Theology, lxxii (1969),  
no.586, pp.153-158.
- R.A. Lipsius and  
M. Bonnet      Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha Vol. I, Peter, Paul  
and Thecla, Thaddaeus. 1891. Vol. II, 1  
(M. Bonnet) Andrew, Bartholemew, John, Matthew.  
1898. Vol. II, 2. Philip, Thomas, Barnabas, 1903.
- F. Loofs      Nestorius and his place in the history of  
Christian doctrine. Cambridge, 1914.
- P. Louis      Albinus. Epitome. Rennes. 1945.
- H. de Lubac      'Typologie et Allegorisme', Recherches de Science  
Religieuse, xxxiv (1947), pp.180-226.
- D. Lys      Ruach: Le Souffle dans l'Ancien Testament,  
Paris, 1962.
- S. MacKenna and  
B.S. Page      Plotinus. Eng. Trans. London 1917-1930; rev. ed.  
1956.
- T.W. Manson      'The Life of Jesus. Some tendencies in present  
day research', in The Background of the N.T. ed.  
W.D. Davies - D. Daube in honour of C.H. Dodd  
(Cambridge, 1956).

- A. Marmorstein      Jews and Judaism in the Earliest Xn Apologies. Expositor, 8th Series. Vol. 17 (1919) 73-80, 100-116.
- H. Marshall      'Palestinian and Hellenistic Christianity: Some Critical Comments', N.T. Studies, 19, pp.271-287.
- E. Massaux      L'influence de l'Évangile de St. Matthieu sur la littérature chrétienne avant saint Irénée. Louvain 1950.
- Maximus Tyrius      See H. Hobein.
- H.G. May      'Cosmological Reference in the Qumran Doctrine of the Two Spirits and in O.T. Imagery, Journal of Biblical Literature, lxxxi (1963), pp.1-14.
- Cte. R. Du Mesnil du Buisson      Études sur les dieux phéniciens hérités par l'Empire romain. 1970. (Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'Empire romain, 14. ed. M.J. Vermaseren. Leiden, in progress). in English, trans. H. Danby. Oxford. 1933.
- The Mishnah      A Rabbinic Anthology. London. 1938.
- C.G. Montefiore and L. Loewe
- F.R. Montgomery      'Loofs Theory of Theophilus of Antioch as a source of Irenaeus, I and II, Journal of Theological Studies, xxxviii (April, 1937), pp. 130-139; (July, 1937), pp.255-266.
- Hitchcock      Judaism in the First Three Centuries of the Christian Era, 3 vols. Cambridge (Mass) 1927-30.
- G.F. Moore      'Intermediaries in Jewish Theology' Harvard Theological Review, xv (1922), pp.41-61.
- C.F.D. Moule      The Birth of the N.T. London, 1966.
- J.H. Moulton      Early Zoroastrianism (Hibbert Lectures. 2nd series. 1912). London. 1913.
- S. Mowinckel      'The Spirit and the Word in the pre-exilic reforming Prophets', Journal of Biblical Literature, liii (1934), pp. 199-227.



**PAGE  
NUMBERING  
AS ORIGINAL**

- I.J. du Pleiss 'Christ as the Only Begotten' Neotestamentica 2 (1968), pp.22-31.
- T.E. Pollard Johannine Christology and the Early Church. Cambridge. 1970.
- G.L. Prestige God in Patristic Thought, London, 1940.  
Fathers and Heretics, London, 1940.
- A. Puech Les Apologistes grecs. Paris, 1912.
- H.C. Puech 'Numénus d'Apamée et les theologies orientales au II<sup>e</sup> siècle'. Annuaire de l'institut de philologie et d'histoire orientales. II. Brussels (1934), pp. 745-778.
- J. Quasten Patrology, 1-111 (Utrecht, Brussels, Antwerp) 1950, 1953, 1963-.  
English Trans. Utrecht, 1953.
- A. Rahlfs Septuaginta.
- W.M. Ramsay Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia, Oxford, 1895-97.  
The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the N.T. (James Sprunt Lectures, 1913). London. 1916.
- A. Richardson An Introduction to the Theology of the N.T. London, 1958.
- J.R. Richards Jesus-Son of God and Son of Man. Penarth. 1973 .
- C.C. Richardson Early Christian Fathers. I. London. 1953.
- J.H. Ropes 'Righteousness' and 'The Righteousness of God' in the O.T. and in St. Paul, Journal of Biblical Literature, xxii (1903), pp.211-27.
- H.H. Rowley The O.T. and Modern Study, Oxford, 1951.
- W. Sanday The Gospels in the Second Century. London. 1876.
- J.N. Sanders The Fourth Gospel in the Early Church. Cambridge. 1943.
- Aurelio de Santos Los Evangelios Apocrifos. Madrid. 1963.
- Otero
- H. Schlier Principalities and Powers in the N.T. Eng. version. Edinburgh and London. 1961.
- W. Schmid Hermenela Regenbogen. (Heidelberg, 1952), pp. 163-82. (Justin's debt to Middle Platonism).
- G. Schrenk et al. Righteousness, Bible Key Words Series, London 1951.



- E. Nestle Novum Testamentum Graece. 1963.
- J. Neusner A History of the Jews in Babylonia. 5 Parts (1966-1970).
- M.P. Nilsson Geschichte der Griechischen Religion, Munich, 1941.  
A History of Greek Religion. Trans. and abridged F.J. Fielden. Oxford. 1925.
- A.D. Nock Conversion. Oxford. 1933.  
Early Gentile Christianity and its Hellenistic Background. New York. 1964.
- R.A. Norris God and world in early Christian theology. London. 1966.
- H.O.E. Oesterley and T.H. Robinson Hebrew Religion. 2nd ed. London. 1947.  
History of Israel, 2 vols. Oxford. 1932.  
An Introduction to the books of the O.T. London. 1934.
- W.O.E. Oesterley The Books of the Apocrypha: their origin, teaching and contents. London. 1914.  
The Wisdom of Egypt and the O.T. in the Light of the Newly discovered 'Teaching of Anem-en-ope'. London. 1927.  
An Introduction to the books of the Apocrypha. London. 1935.  
The Jews and Judaism during the Greek period: the background of Christianity. London. 1941.
- R.L. Ottley The Doctrine of the Incarnation, London. 1904.
- J. Pedersen 'Wisdom and Immortality' Vetus Testamentum. Suppl. iii (1955), pp.238-46.
- W. Peek Der Isishymnus von Andros und verwandte Texte erklärt. Berlin, 1930.
- R.H. Pfeiffer History of N.T. Times, London, 1963.
- O. Pfleiderer Primitive Christianity: its writings and teachings in their historical connections. Trans. W. Montgomery. London. 1906-11.
- S. Pines The Jewish Christians of the Early Centuries of Christianity according to a new source 1966 (Proceedings Isr. Ac. Sc. and Hum. ii,13).

- H. Schultz O.T. Theology (Eng. trans. from 4th German edition. J.A. Paterson). Edinburgh, 1892.
- E. Schweizer 'Gegenwart des Geistes und Eschatologische Hoffnung bei Zarathustra, spätjüdischen Gruppen, Gnostikern und den Zeugen des Neuen Testaments', The Background of the N.T. and its Eschatology, edd. W.D. Davies and D. Daube, Cambridge, 1956.
- Lordship and Discipleship, London, 1960.
- The Spirit of God, Bible Key Words Series, London, 1960.
- A. Schweitzer The Quest of the Historical Jesus (London 1954).
- C.A.A. Scott Christianity according to St. Paul, Cambridge, 1927.
- E.F. Scott The Spirit in the N.T. London, 1923.
- A. Souter Novum Testamentum Graece. 1962.
- The Text and Canon of the N.T. ed. C.S.C. Williams. 1954.
- A. Sperber The Bible in Aramaic. Leiden. 1959.
- K. Stendahl 'Implications of Form-Criticism and Tradition-Criticism for Biblical Interpretation', Journal of Biblical Literature, lxxvii (1958).pp.33-38.
- The Scrolls and the N.T. London, 1958.
- The School of St. Matthew and its use of the O.T. Uppsala. 1954.
- M. Takahashi 'An Oriental's Approach to the Problems of Angelology', Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft. LXXVIII (1966), 346 ff.
- L.R. Taylor Divinity of the Roman Empire, Connecticut, 1931.
- H.M. Teeple The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet. Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature. 1957.
- Theaetetus Anonymer Kommentar zu Platons Theaetet. See. H. Hobein.
- H. Thesleff 'An Introduction to the Pythagorean Writings of the Hellenistic Period'.  
Acta Academiae Aboensis Humaniora, xxiv (1961), 3ff.



- P. Thomas                    Apuleius. De philosophia libri. Leipzig. 1908.
- J. Toutain                    Les Cultes Païens dans l'Empire Romain, Paris, 1907.
- J.M.C. Toynbee                Art in Roman Britain, London, 1962.
- H.E.W. Turner                The patristic doctrine of redemption. London. 1952.
- H. Usener                    Epicurea, Leipzig. 1887.
- M.J. Vermaseren              Etudes Preliminaires aux Religions Orientales. Leiden, 1961-.
- I. V. Nesselzky. Die Agyptischen Kulte zur Römer-zeit in Ungarn 1961.
- II. Z. Kádár. Die kleinasiatisch-syrischen Kulte zur Römer-zeit in Ungarn 1962.
- Corpus Inscriptionum et Monumentorum Religionis Mithriacae, Leiden 1956-.
- A. Vööbus                    Early Versions of the N.T. Stockholm, 1954.
- C. Wessely                    The Paris Magical Papyrus (Denkschriften der philosophisch-historischen Classe der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Wien, xxxvi (1888), pp.44-126, pp.139-148.
- M. Wilcox                    The Semitisms of Acts, Oxford, 1965.
- H.F. Wiles                    The Spiritual Gospel, Cambridge, 1960.
- The Christian Fathers, London, 1966.
- The Making of Christian Doctrine, Cambridge 1967.
- A. Lukyn Williams            'The Lord of Hosts', Journal of Theological Studies, xxxviii (Jan. 1937), pp.50-56.
- J.C.M. Van Winden            Calcidius on Matter. His Doctrine and Sources. Leiden. 1959.
- G. Wissowa                    Religion und Kultus der Römer. Munich, 1912.
- R.E. Witt                    Isis in the Graeco-Roman World. London 1971.
- H.A. Wolfson                The philosophy of the Church Fathers. Cambridge (Mass.). 1956.
- H.B. Workman                Persecution in the Early Church, London, 1960.
- L.E. Wright                  Alterations to the words of Jesus in the second century. Harvard. 1952.
- J.E. Yates                    The Spirit and the Kingdom, London, 1963.